REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 354 48
LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD--INDO-PACIFIC FASCICLE THREE.
BY- VOEGELIN, FLORENCE M.
INDIANA UNIV., BLOOMINGTON
REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-63-7 PUB DATE DEC 64
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-9488
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.27 HC-$5.36 134P. ANTHROPOLOGICAL
LINGUISTICS, 6(9)/1-125, DEC. 1964

DESCRIPTORS- *LANGUAGES, *INDONESIAN LANGUAGES, BLOOMINGTON, INDIANA, ARCHIVES OF LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD

LISTS AND DESCRIPTIONS OF THE LANGUAGES OF MELANESIA AND POLYNESIA ARE PROVIDED. (THIS REPORT IS PART OF A SERIES, ED 010 350 TO ED 010 367.) (JK)

ED010354

63-7

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Anthropological Linguistics

Volume 6 Number 9

December 1964

Title

LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD:

INDO-PACIFIC FASCICLE THREE

A Publication of the
ARCHIVES OF LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD
Anthropology Department
Indiana University

ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS is designed primarily, but not exclusively, for the immediate publication of data-oriented papers for which attestation is available in the form of tape recordings on deposit in the Archives of Languages of the World. This does not imply that contributors will be restricted to scholars working in the Archives at Indiana University; in fact, one motivation for the publication of ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS is to increase the usefulness of the Archives to scholars elsewhere by making publishable data and conclusions and their tape recorded attestation more widely available. (Recorded attestation of papers from scholars elsewhere will be copied by the Archives and the original recordings returned to the collector; others may then work with the tape copy either in the Archives or elsewhere by having a copy sent to them.) In addition to heavily exemplified papers in the form of preliminary or final statements on restricted problems in phonemics, morphophonemics, morphemics, syntax and comparative grammar, ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS will include lexical lists and analyzed texts (especially in the otherwise hard-to-publish range of 20 to 100 pages) and theoretical and methodological papers (especially in the form of papers from symposia).

Each volume of ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTICS consists of nine numbers to be issued during the months of January, February, March, April, May, June, October, November and December. Subscriptions ($3.50 a year) and papers for publication should be sent to the editor, Dr. Florence M. Voegelin, Anthropology Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana.

Entered as second class matter at the postoffice
at Bloomington, Indiana

Anthropological Linguistics

Florence M. Voegelin

Editor

VOLUME VI

1964

A Publication of the
ARCHIVES OF LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD
Anthropology Department
Indiana University

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

CONTENTS OF VOLUME VI

1

David D. Thomas: Transformational Paradigms From Clause Roots . 1
S. A. Pillai: Tamil Nouns 7
Ashok R. Kelkar and Pran Nath Trisal: Kashmiri Word Phonology: A First Sketch 13
Lynette Oates: Distribution of Phonemes and Syllables in Gugu-Yalanji 23
Charles T. Scott: Syllable Structure in Teheran Persian 27

2

Kibbey M. Horne: Graphic Representation of Social Isoglosses 1
R. J. Goodell: An Ethnolinguistic Bibliography with Supporting Material in Linguistics and Anthropology 10

3

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin: Languages of the World: Sino-Tibetan Fascicle One 1

4

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin: Languages of the World: Indo-Pacific Fascicle One 1

5

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin: Languages of the World: African Fascicle One 1

6

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin: Languages of the World: Native America Fascicle One 1

7

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin: Languages of the World: Indo-Pacific Fascicle Two 1

8

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin: Languages of the World: Ibero-Caucasian and Pidgin-Creole Fascicle One 1

9

C. F. and F. M. Voegelin: Languages of the World: Indo-Pacific Fascicle Three 1

LANGUAGES OF THE WORLD
INDO-PACIFIC FASCICLE THREE

C.F. and F. M. Voegelin

Indiana University

3.1. Unified list of Austronesian Languages in Melanesia

3.2. Sample of sound systems in Melanesia

3.3. Bauan dialect of Fijian

3.4. Rotuman sentence profiles

For authorship and sponsorship, see Languages of the World: Sino-Tibetan Fascicle One (0.1). The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

3.1. Difficulties encountered in bringing order into the diversity of languages spoken in the Melanesian area have been discussed in Indo-Pacific Fascicle One (1.3). The lexicostatistic work brought together and interpreted by Dyen (1963) points up the diversity in Melanesia, and supports one clear-cut classification, but one which might be expected to conflict with classifications postulated on the basis of other kinds of evidence. Nevertheless, we follow the Dyen classification at this juncture, as far as possible. Our objective, however, is to bring together all the language names known for Melanesia that are neither Papuan nor Polynesian, while Dyen restricted himself to Austronesian languages for which he had basic vocabulary lists. Where it is not possible to follow Dyen because Dyen does not include as many languages as we do, we superimpose the classification of others—chiefly Capell and Grace. Where Dyen does not include languages, there is of course no conflict in classifications. Where both Grace and Dyen classify, and there is conflict in their classifications, we follow Dyen. However, the resulting list of Austronesian languages which is given here is not primarily concerned with choosing among alternative classifications, but rather with extending a clear-cut classification which includes few languages by adding to it other languages that probably fall in the same classification. We include names mentioned in the literature as summarized by Capell (1962) and Salzner (1960) with the realization that for some areas the proliferation of names may not even represent dialect differences.

Certain languages are noted as being 'ungrouped', and this refers to Dyen's use of the term in a special sense, according to which shared basic vocabulary of the language in question is insufficient to establish a subrelationship with any other Austronesian language in the given area under discussion.

We do not include in the list of languages of Melanesia the languages of West New Guinea (West Irian, formerly Netherlands New Guinea) because languages 'grouped' by Dyen in this area do not show their closest relationship with languages within Melanesia, and because none of these languages are included in Grace's Eastern Malayo-Polynesian. These West New Guinea languages will appear in Indo-Pacific fascicles concerned with Indonesia.

The order of listing that we follow is oriented from west to east slanting from north to south, in general; in each particular area, however, the order of listing begins with the languages whose classification is supported by Dyen's lexicostatistics.

Dyen's comparisons did not include any word lists from the Admiralty Islands, north of Australian New Guinea, on which virtually no linguistic information has been published. Grace (1955) classifies the languages of the Admiralty Islands and the Western Islands (Ninigo, etc.), except Aua and Wuvulu, together as a subgroup of his 'Eastern Malayo-Polynesian' distinct from the subgroup consisting of Aua and Wuvulu. The only available detailed classification of the languages of the Admiralties is that prepared by W.E. Smythe, Government Medical Officer at Manus for several years before 1949, cited by Capell (1962). This classification is reproduced below, modified by the elimination of double classification of certain names. Smythe's statement that there were 23 languages spoken on Manus would seem to imply that he regarded the names grouped under each of his 21 'types' on Manus to be dialects of the same language—i.e. his 'type' equals 'language'. The difficulty of obtaining figures for the number of speakers of each language is magnified by the fact (supplied also by Smythe) that except on the islands of Aua (population 230 in 1938) and Wuvulu (population 251 in 1938) and the Ninigos (population 261 in 1938) and in a dozen or so villages on the southeast coast of Manus with scattered settlements on other islands, a large part of the population now speaks Neo-Melanesian exclusively, and the tendency to replace the native languages with Neo-Melanesian is increasing. The total population of the Admiralties was 13,226 in 1951.

Group I : Aua and Wuvulu

Group II : Ninigo Islands and the now extinct Anchorite Islands

Group III : Manus with its adjacent islands, and the Hermit Islands

Sub-group I of Group III

- Family (i) Type a. Sori, Harengan
  - b. Luf, Marun
- (ii) a. Hus
  - b. Andra
  - c. Ponam
  - d. Nyada, Alokuk, Buboi, Lesau (these four may belong rather with 2 (ii) c)
- (iii) a. Baluan, Pam, Lou
  - b. Rambutjo, Nauna
- (iv) a. Buyang, Kawaliap, Tingou, Lowa, Liap
  - b. Waimdra, Badlok, Munduburew, Pundru
  - c. Mundrau, Sau, Kup, Derambat
  - d. Tawi (the form spoken on Manus - Island Tawi is 2 (i) c), Ndramndrau, Ndrabito, Hatwara, Uldrau, Marawurei, Loitja
- (v) a. Tongo, Sabon, Lundret, Warabei, Ndranu, Yiringo

b. Ndrosun, Laues, Yiriw, Kapo, Sira, Sonilu, Bulihan, Katin, Bua, Malai

Sub-group 2 of Group III

Family (i) Type a. Mokareng, Papitalai, Ndranggot, Labahan, Bowat, Loniu

b. Bipi, Kali, Sapondralis, Bundrahai, Gogo, Kabuli, Ndroliu, Salien

c. Mok, Patusi, Mbunai, Bomsau, Mbuge, Ndrihol, Bursu, Peli, Tawi Island

d. Pityilu (may belong rather with I (v) a)

(ii) a. Lebei, Lindrou, Babun, Ndrehet, Malai

b. Tulu, Bowai, Laues, Ndrabwi, Kabanu, Peli, Lala, Yiri, Lowakai, Aran, Lorengau, Leiwa, Loi

(iii) c. Pak, Tong

We now turn to the Austronesian languages of the mainland part of Australian New Guinea and Papua. The languages in these areas are listed according to their genetic classifications, as far as this is known, but neighboring languages are added in order to bring together all the Austronesian names for each administrative district in the general areas of mainland Australian New Guinea and Papua.

Kairiru with 1,906 speakers in the Sepik District is 'ungrouped'.

The languages of the few Austronesian-speaking groups scattered along the coast and off-shore islands of the Sepik District have been so little studied that only a listing of other names mentioned in the area (with occasional population figures) is possible. Most of these people are said to also speak Neo-Melanesian.

Sisano

Malol (3,330)

Suain (Ulau-Suein) (909)

Yakamul (1,318)

Wogeo

Terebu (Turupu) (4,000)

Kis

Samap (111)

Arop (Waropu)

The following three are spoken on islands of the same names close to Aitape on the north central coast:

Tumleo (439)

Ali

Seleo (Seliu).

Blupblup, spoken in the Schouten Islands, is 'ungrouped'. Grace tentatively grouped with the languages of the Schouten Islands, just off the coast of the eastern end of the Sepik District, the language of Manam Island, off the coast of the western end of the Madang District:

Manam-Sepa-Wanami, spoken on Manam Island, Madang, New Guinea and in Sepa and Wanami on the adjacent mainland by emigrants from Manam.

Grace classifies as one of the subgroups of his Eastern Malayo-Polynesian the languages of the Astrolabe Bay area of the Madang District. Names given in this area include:

Graged, spoken by over 6,000 people on Sek, Yabob, Karkar, and Bagabag Islands

Ham

Ganglau

Mindiri
Biliau
Peterei
Yamai
Malangai
Yoria
Galek
Swit
Yamas
Megiar and Matukar.

The following four languages spoken in the Morobe District were classified as 'ungrouped' by Dyen, with the note that an 'adequate' list for Tami might have placed it in the Malayopolynesian Linkage:

Acira (Atsera)-Amari with 4,901 and 2,915 speakers, respectively, in 1937
Hapa (Labu')
Nubami
Tami (Taémi) spoken on an island off the coast of the Morobe District.

Grace included in the same group as Tami four languages of the Morobe District:

Yabim (Yabem) (1,606 speakers in 1937)
Bukaua (Bukawa, Kawa) (2,535 speakers in 1937)
Kelana (Kela, Laukanu)
Suam, as well as the languages of SW New Britain and intervening islands.

Other languages spoken in the Morobe District are:

Wampur (Laewamba) (2,521 speakers in 1937)
Kaiwa (844 speakers in 1937)
Buang (7,000 speakers in 1964) along the Snake River in the Mumeng Sub-District.

Momolili (Momalili)

Kai

Aramot, spoken on Aramot Island

Tuam, spoken on Tuam Island

and the following three on Umboi Island:

Umboi

Barim

Iangla.

Four languages of the Milne Bay District are found by Dyen to form a 'Tip Cluster', subclassified in the following manner.

1. Wedauic Subfamily
    1. Weduan (Wedau-Awalama-Taupota), spoken on the northeast coast of Milne Bay
    2. Keheraran (Kehelala)-Basilaki, spoken on the East Cape and Moresby Island
2. Dobic Subfamily
    1. Dobu-Tewara, spoken on Dobu Island, adjacent small islands and the adjacent tip of Normanby Island in the D'Entrecasteaux Islands; the population of the Esa'ala District is 31,182, but it is not known how many of these speak Dobu—or a dialect thereof—as a native language rather than as a second language.
    2. Molima (Morima), spoken on Ferguson Island in the D'Entrecasteaux Islands

Grace includes the mainland members of the Tip Cluster in a larger subgroup consisting of the languages of the north coast of the mainland of Papua from Milne Bay to Collingwood Bay. Names in this area include:

Ubir, spoken on Collingwood Bay in the Northern District; Ubir is excluded from this grouping (and 'ungrouped') by Dyen on the basis of lexicostatistical evidence.

Mukawa
Anuki
Daraloia.

The island members of Dyen's Tip Cluster are spoken on the D'Entrecasteaux Islands; names of other groups on the D'Entrecasteaux Islands include:
Kalokalo and
Bwaidoga (8,600 speakers) on Goodenough Island
On Ferguson Island and the adjacent Amplett Islands are:
Gumasi
Gwabegwabe
Salakahadi
Kukuya
(Tewara, spoken on small islands east of Ferguson Island, is said to be a dialect of Dobu, and hence listed with Dobu above)
Sanaroa on an island between Tewara and Dobu Island, may belong with either Dobu or Molima.
On Normanby Island the following groups are listed south of the Dobu:
Duau (Bunama-Urada-Sawabwala)
Roboda
Guregureu
Nuakata, on a small island south of Normanby.

Panayati, spoken in the Luisiade Archipelago east of Milne Bay by some 10,100 people, is 'ungrouped' by Dyen. Capell treats Misima, spoken on the adjacent St. Aignan Island as a dialect of Panayati and the Misima are included in the population figure given for Panayati. Grace includes as one subgroup of a Milne Bay subgroup of his Eastern Malayo-Polynesian the languages spoken in the area from the island of Mugura (Mugula), off the southern coast of the central Milne Bay district to Misima Island. Other names listed in this area are:

Miaitopa
Sinaki
Bohutu
Suau (Bonarua - Brierley Is. - Brumer Is. - Daui - Duchateau Is. - Heath Is.- Igora (Aigora) - Rogea (Logea) - Mugura (Mugula, Bonabona))
Tavara
Maiwara
Wagawaga
Daiomoni
Ewatiaga
Sariba
Tubetube, on Engineer Island
Wari (Ware), on Teste Island
Panakrusima, in the Calvados Chain
Sabari, also in the Calvados Chain.

Tagula (Sudest, Rewa), with 1,900 speakers on Sud Est (Tagula) Island, is treated by Grace as a separate subgroup of his Milne Bay subgroup; Tagula is also mentioned as 'aberrant' by Capell.

The remaining subgroup of Grace's Milne Bay subgroup consists of Kiriwina Island (in the Trobriand Islands), Woodlark Island, the Laughlin Islands and, presumably, the intervening and neighboring smaller islands. Language names given for these islands are:

Kiriwina (8,600 speakers
Gawa, in the Marshall Bennett Islands
Murua, on Woodlark Island
Tokunu, on the Alcester Islands
Nada, on Laughlin Island.

In Papua a pidgin language, Police Motu, is widely used as a lingua franca. This pidgin is based on Motu, which is the native language of a few thousand people in the Central District of Papua. Motu is classified by Dyen as 'ungrouped', but a member of the Heonesian Linkage, the other members of which are seven languages spoken in Melanesia—Mota, Efate, Kerebuto, Lau, Toqabaita, Rotuman, and Fijian—and the Polynesian Subfamily (2.1, above).

Grace (1955) grouped together all the languages spoken in the Central District of Papua; besides Motu, these include:

Roro
Mekeo-Kovio
Hula-Keapara-Kerepunu-Keakalo-Aroma
Karo
Galoma
Ikoro
Sinaugoro
Kabadi
Lala (Pokau , Nala, Nara)
Doura
Kuni.

The following three languages in the area of northern New Ireland are 'ungrouped' by Dyen:

Mussau (Musau) spoken on Mussau (St. Matthias) Island, north of New Hanover (Emirau on Emirau Island, just southwest of Musau, is listed by Salzner as a dialect of Mussau)

Dang (Lavongai) spoken on New Hanover Island, just off the northern tip of New Ireland

Nalik (Lugagun) spoken in north central New Ireland.

Other language names given for New Ireland and the adjacent islands are:

Dyaul on Dyaul Island, west of northern New Ireland;

In northern New Ireland:

Omo (Tigak)

Lemusmus

Fesoa (Fissoa, Butam);

In south central New Ireland:

Kulube (Kolube)-Ugana

Komalu (Kanalu, Barok)

Kanapit

Gelik-Kinsal (Hinsal);

In southern New Ireland:

Pala (Patpatar)

Nokon

Muliama-Konomola

Siar

King

Lamasa

Lambon;

East of New Ireland, in north to south order, on islands of the same names as the languages, are:

Tabar

Lihir (Lir)

Tanga

Anir

Nisan (Nissan).

Grace (1955) classified together as one of the subgroups of his Eastern Malayo-Polynesian the languages of New Hanover and New Ireland, listed above, and those of Duke of York Island (between New Ireland and New Britain) and of the northern half of New Britain. The three languages of the New Hanover-New Ireland area and four of the languages of northern New Britain area included in Dyen's classification were 'ungrouped' (i.e. did not share sufficient basic vocabulary with any other languages spoken in the same one of the four major areas in which Austronesian is spoken to warrant grouping). The other three of Dyen's languages of northern New Britain constitute a group, the Uvolic Cluster, which also is 'ungroupable' with other languages in Melanesia. Dyen's 'ungrouped' languages of northern New Britain are:

Gunantuna (Blanche Bay, Tinata Tuna, Tuna, New Britain, Kuanua), which is used as a lingua franca throughout New Britain and New Ireland and spoken as a native language on the Gazelle Peninsula

(Malu, spoken on Duke of York Island, is treated as a dialect of Gunantuna by Capell)

Tomoip (Tomoyp, Tumuip)

Peleata

Pililo, spoken on Pililo Island, south of New Britain.

The Uvolic Cluster consists of:

1. Uvol
2. The Mamusic Genus:
    1. Mamusi
    2. Mengen

The following appear in the literature as names of languages spoken in the area of northern NewBritain west of the Gazelle Peninsula and between the languages of the Uvolic Cluster and Tomoip and the languages of the Willaumez Linkage (below):

Meramera (Mera Mera)
Vele Uasi
Maututu
Rogo
Lote
Arawe.

In south central New Britain, Dyen groups the languages of the Willaumez Peninsula and neighboring coast as the Willaumez Linkage, consisting of:

1. Nakanai
2. Bakovi (Kove, Kobe?)
3. perhaps Kapore.

Additional names listed by Capell on the Willaumez Peninsula are:

Bulu
Bola (Bolo)
Garua (Karua).

For Kilenge (Kilengge) spoken on the southwestern tip of New Britain

Dyen had only a 'subadequate' word list, on the basis of which he classifies Kilenge as probably 'ungrouped'. Both Grace and Capell regard the languages of southwestern New Britain as forming a closely related group. Capell lists, in addition to Kilenge, the following names in this area:

Kaliai

Bariai

Sahe (Sake)

Vitu, spoken on Vitu Island, north of western New Britain.

In the northern Solomon Islands, Dyen's lexicostatistic data yields a Buka Subfamily, subclassified as follows:

1. Northwest Buka Subfamily
    1. Petatsic Subfamily
        1. Petats, spoken natively on the three small islands of Petats, Pororan and Hitau off the west coast of Buka and used as Lingua franca in the half are said to speak or understand Petats.
        2. Sumoun, spoken on the western side of Buka Island, is so closely related to Petats by Dyen's evidence as to possibly be a dialect of the same language.
    2. Halian Subfamily
        1. Hanahan (Halia), spoken or understood by 3-4,000 on northeastern Buka.
        2. Lontes (Lontis), spoken in northern Buka.
2. Teopic Subfamily
    1. Teop, with 1600 speakers in 1959.
    2. Raosiara, which is so closely related to Teop that it may be a

dialect of the same language; both are spoken in northeastern Bougainville.

3. Saposa, with 200 speakers on Saposa Island, just south of the northern tip of Bougainville.

Additional names of Austronesian-speaking peoples in the Buka-Bougainville area grouped by Capell with languages listed in Dyen's Buka Subfamily are:
Sailo, with 1450 speakers in 1959, and
Kilinailau, which are said to belong to the same group as Hanahan, above,
Halisa
Matsungan
Timputs, 1150 speakers
Taiof
Torau, 800 speakers
Rorovana
Uruava
Hanon.

Banoni, spoken by 12,500 people in southwestern Bougainville, is classified by Dyen as 'ungrouped'. Grouped with Banoni by Capell is
Piva, with 300 speakers.

Mono, spoken on Treasury Island (by the Mono), on Shortland Island (by the Alu or Alo), and on Fauro Island (by the Fauro) in the Bougainville Straits is 'ungrouped'. The total population of the islands of the Bougainville Straits was 1,301 in 1931.

The languages of Choiseul Island (population 5,000 in 1950) in the northern Solomons classified by Dyen constitute the Choiseul Subfamily, which is subclassified as follows:

1. Ririan Subfamily

    1. Sengan (Sengga, Sisingga)-Babatena (Bambatana)-Kuboro (Kumboro)
    2. Ririo

2. Varisian Subfamily
    1. Variṣi
    2. Vagua (Tavola, Tavula).

Both Grace and Capell regard all the languages of Choiseul Island as forming a closely related group. Additional names are:

Lömaumbi
Katazi
Ruruvai (Ruravai)
Vasengasenga (Singasinga)
Kunambena (Kurubena, Mbota)
Liuliu
Moli (Mole)
Kiposaka (Tipasaka)
Gubinengo (Tuga)
Gongoroi
Maran
Tasobi
Katoratele
Virulata
Kirunggela
Subi
Taura (Raura, Laura),
And on small islands off Choiseul:
Tambatamba (Tabataba, Tarikukuri)

Velaviuru

Vagena.

The languages of the New Georgia Archipelago in the central Solomon Islands are treated as one subgroup by Grace (1955), Capell (1962), and Dyen (1963). The following constitute Dyen's New Georgian Subfamily:

1. Rovianic Subfamily (the combined population figure for these, spoken on New Georgia Island, and Marovan, below, was said to be 2,294 in 1959; elsewhere the number of speakers of Roviana—including second-language speakers—is said to be greater than a figure of 3,000 for the number of native speakers of Marovan).
    1. Roviana (Rubiana)
    2. Kusagean (Kusage-Hoava)
2. Marovan (Marovo-Bareke-Vangunu), spoken on New Georgia Island and Vangunu Island as a native language by 3,000 (compare the figure above for the Rovianic Subfamily plus Marovan) and by 2,000 more as a lingua franca second language.
3. Lunggic Subfamily
    1. Lunggan (Lungga (Luqa)-Kubokota-Madegugusu), with 1,500-2,000 speakers on Ganongga (Luqa, Ranonga, Vesu Gogoto) Island and Simbo (Eddystone) Island.
    2. Duke (Nduke), with 732 speakers on Nduke (Kolombangara) Island.

Additional language names given for the New Georgia area are:

Gatukai (Ngatokae), just east of Vangunu Island

Ugele, with 400 speakers on the north end of Rendova Island

Wanawana

Eongo

Ramata (Ngerasi)

Burongo

Viru (Kuvilana)

Batuna

Podokana

Tetepari.

The total population of Santa Isabel (Ysabel) Island in the central Solomons was 6,000 in 1956. Both of the Santa Isabel languages classified by Dyen—Zabana and Mahaga—are 'ungrouped', but Mahaga, for which he had only a 'subadequate' word list is said to probably belong to the Heonesian Linkage (see Motu in the Central District of Papua, above).

Kia, with 1250 speakers on the northern end of the island, is said to have much contact, and possibly closer linguistic connection, with Roviana on New Georgia.

Bogotu (Bogota)-Hageulu-Vulava, with 1500 speakers on the southern end of the island, is grouped by Capell with the languages of Guadalcanal and Florida Islands.

In the center of Santa Isabel Island there are a number of 'Bush' languages spoken by small tribes. So little work has been done on them that it is still uncertain whether they are Austronesian languages or Papuan languages with Austronesian loanwords from Bogotu (Capell is inclined to the latter opinion). Names of these doubtfully Austronesian groups include:

Jajao

Kilokaka

Longgahaja (Logahaja)

Hogirano

Aara-Maringe

Gao (Nggao)
Maga
Kakatio
Susulu.

Two languages on the northern end of Malaita Island in the central Solomons constitute Dyen's Lauic Subfamily, which belongs to the Heonesian Linkage (compare Motu in the Central District of Papua above):

Lau-Suafa-Ngongosila, with 3500 speakers
Toqabaita (Toʔabaita)-Baelelea-Baengu.

In the same subgroup as the languages of the Lauic Subfamily Capell puts:

Maluʔu, with 4,000 speakers
Dai, with 134 speakers
Takwa.

Names of other languages or dialects on Malaita are divided by Capell into three additional subgroups. The first of these includes:

Kwaraʔae (Fiu), with 7,000 speakers
Fataleka, with 3,000 speakers.

Another subgroup includes:

Kwaio (Koio)-Uru, with 4,000 speakers
Kwarekwareo, with 1,000 speakers
Areare-Doria with 15,000 speakers
Iʔiaa, with 1,000 speakers
Langalanga, with 2,500 speakers
Marau, spoken on Guadalcanal Island.

The remaining subgroup includes:

Oroha

Sa?a (Apae?aa), with 5,000 speakers

Ulawa

Ugi.

Kerebuto-Baranago, the only language spoken on Guadalcanal Island in the central Solomons included in Dyen's classification, belongs to the Heonesian Linkage. Except for Marau, which he groups with the languages of Malaita, Capell regards the languages of Guadalcanal, the total population of which was 15,000 in 1950, as forming "a single group with subdivisions". One of these subdivisions consists of:

Vaturanga

Gari

Malango

Poleo

Gua-Hua.

A second subdivision includes:

Lengo

Gambata

Datovitu

Aola.

A third subdivision includes:

Longgu

Birao

Moli.

The two members of a fourth subdivision are:

Ṭalisi (Tolo)

Koo.

Sugu (Suhu), described by Bouillon, is not included as such in Capell's list.

Inakona is said to be 'distinct'.
Nggela (Gela), spoken on northern Guadalcanal and Florida Island is grouped with Bogotu spoken on Santa Isabel Island.

The total population of the islands of San Cristoval, Ugi and Ulawa (the languages of which are grouped with those of Malaita, above) and Santa Cruz in the southern Solomons is approximately 8,000. On the basis of a 'sub-adequate' word list Dyen classified Bauro, to which Capell adds the dialect (place) name Haununu, as perhaps belonging to the Heonesian Linkage. Two other languages are spoken on San Cristoval, the second also being spoken on the adjacent islands of Santa Ana (Owa Raha) and Catalina (Owa Riki):
Arosi-Wango
Kahua-Tawarafa-Anganiwai-Wanoni (Narihua).

Davenport (1962) presents lexicostatistical evidence to show that the three languages of Utupua Island, in the Santa Cruz Archipelago of the southern Solomon Islands, do not form a very closely related group. Similar evidence was not obtained for the neighboring island of Vanikoro but informants reported that Vanikoro was closely related to Atago on Utupua. Thus, there are at least three and possibly four non-Polynesian Austronesian languages spoken in the Santa Cruz Archipelago:
Atago (Tanabili) with only a few speakers, who now also speak Apako
Apako (Asimboa) with 53 speakers
Aba (Nimbau, Nemboa) with 119 speakers
Vanikoro with 125 speakers.

One of the subgroups of Grace's Eastern Malayo-Polynesian consists of the languages of the Banks and Torres Islands just north of the New Hebrides Islands plus the languages of Pentecost (Raga), Aurora (Maewo), and Leper's

(Omba) Islands in the northern New Hebrides. Dyen's word lists included only one representative of this group, Mota, spoken on Mota or Sugarloaf Island in the Banks by 256 people in 1959. Mota is a member of Dyen's Heonesian Linkage. On the basis of a list of 70 words of which 57.1-68.5% were shared between Mota and the languages of Aurora, Leper's, and northern Pentecost Islands, Capell also groups these with the Banks Island languages, excluding the languages of central and southern Pentecost Island which he groups with Paama, spoken on Lamenu Island. Other language names given for the Banks Islands include:

Merlav, with 800 speakers in 1959, on the southeasternmost of the Banks Islands
Gog (Gaua) on the Gaua Island
Lakon on Gaua Island
Mosin on Vanua Lava Island
Pak on Vanua Lava Island (the population of a subgroup—largely on Vanua Lava—including Pak, Tekel, Sasar and Vuras was 300-400 in 1959)
Tekel (Teqel), with 107 speakers on Ureparapara Island in 1959 plus speakers on Vanua Lava
East Ureparapara
Alo Teqel
Vuras (Vureas, Avreas) on Vanua Lava
Sasar on Vanua Lava
Volow (Valuva, Valuga), with 36 speakers on Saddle Island
Motlav, with 800 speakers on Saddle Island
Merig, with 75 speakers in the southeastern Banks
Leha
Rowa

Bun

Quatpe

Vatrat

Leon

Lomrig

Lusa

Qei

Tolay

Veverau

Luwai

Maligo

Tasmate

Ulrata

Togla

Retan.

The one language of the Torres Islands, north of the Banks, is spoken by some 186 people. The three dialects are spoken on islands of the same names, with Lo also being spoken on Tegua Island:

Torres Islands (Hiw-Toga-Lo).

The languages and dialects of Aurora (Maewo) Island are:

Maewo (Tanoriki), with 838 speakers, of which the following may be dialects, or closely related (dying) languages:

Bangoro

Arata

Lotora.

The speech of Leper's (Omba) is reported to be 'basically one' language by Capell, but there is some question of non-reciprocal intelligibility of dialects and Duindui has been said to differ considerably from the other dialects:

Omba (Walurigi)-Lombaha (Lobaha, Lolopwepwe)-Longana-Lolsiwoi (Lolokara)-Tavalavola-Duindui, with 5,356 speakers in 1959.

The language of the northern part of Pentecost (Raga) Island is now also spoken on the southern end of Aurora Island:

Lamalanga (North Raga, Katvenua, Qatvenua, Bwatvenua, Vunmarana), of which there were 1500 speakers in 1959.

In the central New Hebrides, Paama (Pauma), with 2,546 speakers in 1959, is 'ungrouped' by Dyen (1963). Capell (1962) groups Paama with the languages of Ambryn Island immediately north of Paama and the languages of the central and southern part of Pentecost Island. Grace (1955) grouped together all the languages of the New Hebrides from Efate north, except those of Aurora, Leper's and Pentecost Islands, i.e. the languages of Santo, Malekula, Epi, Sesake, and Efate Islands. These would not form a group in Dyen's classification since, on the basis of lexicostatistical evidence, all three of the languages from this area included in his sample (Paama, Male and Efate) are 'ungrouped'. However, the languages of Ambryn and central and southern Pentecost might constitute a group with Paama.

On the basis of the information given by Capell on comparison of earlier word lists it seems possible that at least three, and possibly four, languages are spoken on Ambryn Island, which had a total population of 5,000 in 1950:

North Ambryn (Olal-Magam)
Central Ambryn (Fanting-Lonwolwol)
South Ambryn (Baiap)

Southeast Ambryn (Craig Cove-Tavaik), with several hundred speakers of the Craig Cove dialect living since 1950 in Maat village near Vila on Efate Island. The combined population of central and southern Pentecost (Raga) Island was 6,500 in 1959; the two languages are

Central Raga (Bwatnapni-Loltong-Melsisi)
South Raga (Ponorwal-Loltavola-Ninebulo).

The population of Malekula Island in the central New Hebrides was 9,500 in 1950. Nale, spoken on Malekula, was 'ungrouped' by Dyen. Capell separates other languages spoken on Malekula into three subgroups, with the northern one further subdivided into two groups:

Small Islands:
Atchin, population 300 (around 1930)
Vao, population 400 (around 1930)
Wala, population 300 (around 1930)
Uripiv, population 100 (around 1930);
Nambas:
Big Nambas
Small Nambas
Lambumbu.
The Eastern subgroup includes:
Aulua
Port Sandwich
Pangkumu
Onua (Unua).
The Southern subgroup includes:
Mewun (Meaun)

Sinesip
Ahamb
Kuliviu.

Other names listed by Capell (1962) or Salzner (1960) for dialects on Malekula Island are:

Orierh
Malua
Laravat
Maragaus
Wuli
Nevat
Winiv
Lamangkau
Fo'oa
Toman (Taman).

Capell groups the languages of Santo (Espiritu Santo) Island (population 9,031 in 1959) with those of Malekula Island in a Northwestern New Hebrides group. Names given for languages on Santo Island are

Nokuku (Nogugu)
Marina (Marino, Big Bay)
Tasiriki
Sakau (Hog Harbour)
Savan
Mavia
Tikipi
St. Philip's Bay

Valpay

Cape Cumberland

Wulua

Eralado.

And on small adjacent islands to the south:

Tangoa

Malo.

Efate, with 3,467 speakers on Efate Island in the south central New Hebrides, belongs to the Heonesian Linkage in Dyen's classification. Capell says Efate has at least three dialects at present—southern (Erakor), northern (Lelepa), and eastern (Eton); Salzner adds another dialect name, Havana Harbor. Capell places Efate in a Central New Hebrides group which includes two other languages, the first of which is said to be 'essentially' the same language as Efate, but lexical evidence is presented to show a fair degree of difference between it and Efate:

Tongoa-Nguna-Buninga-Sesake-Metaso-Emua-Paunangis, with 2,200 to 2,500 speakers on the small islands of the same names between Epi and Efate Islands and on Efate Island (the last two dialects)

Makura, with 1,100-1,200 speakers on Makura Island, half of Tongoa Island, Tongariki Island, and Buninga Island.

Additional names in the Efate Island group listed by Salzner are

Pango

Livara.

Other languages spoken in the central New Hebrides are those on Epi Island. The first three are sometimes treated as one language under the cover term 'Epi':

Tasiko (Lemaroro)-Lewo (Levo, Laëvo, Maluba)-Lamanu-Bierebo-Tasiriki-Nikaura for which the population estimates vary from 1,100 of 1,400 total population of the island to the same proportion of 3,300 as to the total population of the island
Baki for which the population estimates vary from 200 of 1,400 total population of the island to the same proportion of 3,300 as the total population of the island
Bieri (Bieria) for which population estimates vary from 50 of 1,400 total population of the island to the same proportion of 3,300 as the total population of the island
Mari.

Dyen's classification includes two languages spoken in the southern New Hebrides, both of which are 'ungrouped':
Aneityum, with 250 speakers
Tanna, with 7,900 speakers. Names of dialects of Tanna in the literature are numerous and may be overlapping: Tanna-Ikyoo-Itonga-Kwamera-Lenakel-Loanatit-Napuanmen (Wassisi, Weasisi, Waesisi)-Naviliang-Nerauya-Nerokwang-Numerat-Rana.
Also in the southern New Hebrides is the island of Eromanga, the languages of which are grouped by Grace with Aneityum and Tanna:
Eromanga (Yoku (Enyau)-Ifo (Utaha)-Potnariven-Sie (Sorung))
Ura, previously classified as a dialect of Eromanga, is said by Capell to be probably not the same language, but a closely related one.

Six languages of northern New Caledonia constitute Dyen's North New Caledonia Cluster, given below with the addition of dialect names, alternate names and numbers of speakers in 1939 from other sources.

1. Camuhic Subfamily

   1. Haekic Subfamily
      1. Haeke ('Aeke, Kone), 600 speakers
      2. Pwamei (Poamei), 500 speakers
   2. Camuhi (Camuki, Tyamuhi, Wagap), 1,200 speakers
2. Thuangic Subfamily
   1. Thuanga (θuanga, Yuanga, Nyua-Bonde), 1,050 speakers
   2. Fwagumwak (Koumac)-Yalasu-Belep (Nenema occurs as a collective name for all the dialects), 1,100 speakers
3. Paici (Pati, Poneriwen), 2,000 speakers.

Leenhardt regards all of the northern New Caledonia languages as forming one closely related subgroup. Other names listed by Leenhardt (1946), Capell or Salzner are

'Avekè, 100 speakers
'Moavèkè, 400 speakers
'Moaekè, 50 speakers
Poapoa, 150 speakers
Wamoang had 3 speakers in 1939, may now be extinct
Moenebeng (Pwebo) 500 speakers.

And the following four groups subsumed under the name Nemi:

Nemi, 700 speakers
Jawe (Ubach), 400 speakers
Pinje, 80 speakers
Poai (Yengen, Yehen), 1,000 speakers.

The languages of Southern New Caledonia were treated as a closely related group distinct from the Northern New Caledonia group by Leenhardt. This division is supported by the lexicostatistical evidence of Dyen. However, Grace on the basis of phonological development (e.g. the occurrence of two-distinction phonemic tone in Paici and Camuhi in the north and Nadubea and Kwenyi, with similar stress-accent in Houailou, in the south) regards all of the New Caledonia languages as forming one group—having shared a common history apart from other members of the family—which may then be further subdivided. The subdivisions of Dyen's South New Caledonia Genus are

1. Wailic Cluster

    1. Houailou (Wailu, Wai, Ajie), 4,000 speakers, plus 150 speakers of Arha, said to be a dialect of Houailou

    2. Haragure ('Aragùrè, Thio), 500 speakers

2. Hameha (Anesu, Kanala), 1,500 speakers

3. Numeic Subfamily

    1. Nadubea (Dubea, Dumbea, Wameni), 700 speakers

    2. Kwenyi (Kunie)-Kapone (Duauru)-Uen (Ouen), 1,100 speakers, including those on the Isle of Pines off the southern tip of New Caledonia.

Other language names listed for southern New Caledonia are

Aro, 300 speakers

Boewe, 400 speakers

Sirhe, 18 speakers in 1939, may now be extinct

Neku, 150 speakers

Ciri, 600 speakers.

In addition to the Polynesian Outlier language Uvea, only three languages are spoken in the Loyalty Islands, east of New Caledonia. These three languages constitute Dyen's Lific Cluster:

Iai (Wen Yai), with 1,000 speakers on Uvea Island in 1939

Dehu (De'u, Lifu), with 6,000 speakers on Lifu Island in 1939

Nengone, with 3,000 speakers on Maré Island in 1939.

The two languages spoken at the easternmost extreme of Melanesia—Fijian and Rotuman—are classified by Dyen (1963) as members of the Heonesian Linkage, the other members being the Polynesian Subfamily, which virtually surrounds Rotuma and the Fiji Islands, Efate, the Lauic Subfamily, Kerebuto, Motu and Mota. The lexicostatistical evidence thus supports the conclusion of Grace's comparative monograph (1959) that "A number of grammatical features [shared innovations] ... indicate that Fijian and Rotuman have a special relationship to the Polynesian languages." However, the lexicostatistical evidence does not support the conclusion, based on comparative work, that this relationship indicates "a period of common history apart from all the remaining languages of the Austronesian family."

Additional information on languages in the area of north central New Britain has appeared in Jerry Allen and Conrad Hurd, Languages of the Cape Hoskins Patrol Post Division of the Talasea Sub-District, New Britain, Department of Information and Extension Services, Port Moresby, Territory of Papua and New Guinea (1963), which subgroups the languages treated on the basis of lexicostatistical evidence, as follows:

I.A.

1. Nakanai (classified in the Willaumez Linkage above), with 5,834 speakers
2. Mera Mera, with 920 speakers
3. Karua, with 799 speakers, listed as Garua above

I.B.

1. Mamusi (Kakuna) (classified in Uvolic Cluster above), with 920 speakers in Cape Hoskins, others outside
2. Mengen

II.A. Bao, with 45 speakers

II.B. Bebeli, with 510 speakers

II.C. Masegi, with 565 speakers

III. Ata, with 912 speakers.

3.2. The non-homogeneous nature of the Austronesian languages spoken in Melanesia is reflected in the diversity of their sound systems as given below, with the languages arranged in the same groups and presented in the same order as in 3.1, above.

The inventories of the sound systems of three of the languages spoken in the Astrolabe Bay area represent the same type for linear distinctions of consonants: 3 stops (plus voicing), 3 (or 2) fricatives, 3 nasals, 2 liquids and 2 semi-vowels. The consonant inventories differ only in respect to the particular fricatives distinguished, plus the addition of two voiced fricatives in one language, and the possible absence of one fricative distinction in one language. Six vowels in a 3 front versus 3 back system — 3 (FB) — are given for one language, and five vowels in a 2 front-back over neutral system — 2 (FB) over N — for the other two languages.

Graged (Gedaged), after Mager, John F., Gedaged-English Dictionary, Columbus, Board of Foreign Missions of the American Lutheran Church (1952):

p	t			k	i	u
b	d			g	e	o
f		s	ŧ		ɛ	a
β				ɣ		
m	n			ŋ		
			r			
			l			
w		y				

Megiar and Matukar inventories from Aloys Kaspruś, The Languages of the Mugil District, NE - New Guinea, Anthropos 37-40. 711, 1942-45:

p	t	k		i		u
b	d	g		e		o
f	s		h		a	
m	n	ŋ				
	l					
	r					
w		y				

The Matukar inventory did not include an /f/.

The consonant inventories of three languages of the Morobe District of New Guinea which are in the same subgroup of Grace's Eastern Malayo-Polynesian are typologically similar in that all show 4 linear distinctions in stops (with /ḳ/ in one language, but /ʔ/ in the other two), plus an additional series of voiced stops, which are prenasalized (prenasalized stops are treated as consonant clusters of nasal plus stop in the analyses of two of the languages), plus labialization of stops at one or more positions (isomorphically treated as unit phonemes versus clusters of stop plus /w/). All three languages make two linear distinctions in voiceless fricatives, /s h/; two have an additional prenasalized voiced fricative, /^{n}z/, in the same position as /s/; Buang also has two other voiced fricatives, /v ɣ/. Two of the languages distinguish 4 nasals /m n n^{y} ŋ/, the third language has these plus back velar /ŋ̣/ and a labialized /ŋ^{w}/. All three languages distinguish two liquids, /l r/, and the semivowel / y /, but only one inventory gives / w / also. The vowel inventories of all three show 3 Front-Back over Neutral systems, with two of the languages showing coexistent 2 Front-Back over Front-Central-Back over Neutral systems.

Buang, after Bruce and Joyce Hooley. Tentative Phonemic Statement: Buang (unpublished S. I. L. manuscript):

p	t		k	k^{w}	ḳ
b	d		g	g^{w}	g̣
	s				
v	^{n}z		ɣ		h
m	n	n^{y}	ŋ	$ŋ^{w}$	ŋ̣
	l				
	r				
w	y				

All voiced stops are pre-nasalized.

Vowels occurring with length and concomitant stress are:

i u
e o
ɛ ɔ
a

Short vowels are:

i u
e o
ɛ ə ɔ
a

Yabem and Bukawa inventories as taken from A. Capell, Two Tonal Languages of New Guinea, BSOAS Vol. XIII, pp. 184-199 (1949) and Otto Dempwolff, Grammatik der Jabêm-Sprache auf Neuguinea, Hamburg Friederichsen, de Gruyter and Company (1939):

Yabem

p	t		k	ʔ
b	d		g	
	s			h
	^{n}z			
m	n	n^y	ŋ	
	l, r			
		y		

Consonant clusters: mb, nd, ng; pw, bw, gw

i	u
e	o
ɛ	ɔ
a	

Vowel clusters: ae, ao, ai, au, ea, ɔa, oe

Vowels occur with two contrasting tones, high versus low (no gliding tones), e.g. íʔ nest: ìʔ wild taro. Voiced stops are followed by V̀ (low-toned vowel) and voiceless stops by V́ (high-toned vowel). The tone of V following a continuant is not predictable.

Bukawa

p	t		k	?
b	d		g	
	s			h
m	n	n^y	ŋ	
	l, r			
		y		

Consonant clusters include: mb, nd, ŋg; pw, bw, gw, and 3-member mbr, mŋg, etc.

i		u
e		o
ɛ		ɔ
	a	

beside

i		u
e		o
ɛ	ə	ɔ
	a	

Vowel clusters are the same as those in Yabem.

Vowels occur with high, mid and low tones, but mid may be 'merely a weakening of high.' A gliding tone also occurs. /ə/ has a restricted distribution with respect to tones, hence two coexisting vowels systems may be set up.

The inventories of Panayati (Panatinani), Panakrusima and Tagula of Grace's Milne Bay subgroup of his Eastern Malayo-Polynesian may be roughly derived from the short word lists included in Sidney H. Ray, The Languages of the Eastern Louisiade Archipelago, BSOAS 9.363, 1937-39.

For Panayati and Panakrusima the examples show:

p	t	k	k^w

b	d	g	g^w	
v	s			h
m	n	ŋ		
	l, r			
w	y			

/d, l, n, g/ occur in word final position as do all the vowels:

i	u
e	o
a	

/ ŋ / and /k^w/ do not occur in the Panakrusima examples, but /g^w/ and /b^w m^w/ do, as does an occasional / ɔ /.

The consonants of Tagula, placed in a different subgroup of Grace's Milne Bay subgroup, differ from those of Panayati and Panakrusima in having an additional linear distinction for stops — a voiced affricate, / ʐ̌ /, and pre-nasalized stops or nasal-stop clusters in all dialects, an additional — palatalized — nasal in two dialects and a voiced - voiceless contrast in the labial fricative, /f v/, in another dialect.

Two languages of the Central District of Papua, Kabadi and Pokau (Lala, Nara, Nala) seem to share the same phonemic inventory, as judged from the transcriptions used in W. M. Strong, Note on the Language of Kabadi, British New Guinea, Anthropos 7, p. 155ff, 1912 and, P. A. Lanyon-Orgill, Grammar of the Pokau Language, Central Division of Papua, New Guinea, BSOAS XI, part 3: 1941, except that the Kabadi examples did not show /t/ or

/ w/ and the Pokau examples did not show / g/ .

p	t	k	i		u
b	d	g	e		o
v	s			a	
m	n				
	r l				

The following phonemic inventory is that of Butam, as given in Carl Laufer, P. Futschers Aufzeichnungen über die Butam-Sprache (Neubritannien), Anthropos 54.183 (1959). Butam is said to have been extinct since 1938.

p	t	k	i		u
b	d	g	e		o
v				a	
m	n	ŋ			
	l				
	r				

The consonant inventory of Malu, a dialect of Gunantuna spoken on Duke of York Island, as given in S. H. Ray, A Comparative Study of the Melanesian Languages, Cambridge (1926), differs from that of Butam in having labialized velar stops and nasals (though no p is listed) and two additional fricatives:

		t	k	k^w
b		d	g	g^w
f	đ	s		
m		n	ŋ	$ŋ^w$
		l		
		r		

i		u
e		o
	a	

Mengen, a member of Dyen's Uvolic Cluster spoken on New Britain, has the following inventory in Hermann Müller, Grammatik der Mengen-Sprache, Anthropos 2, 80-99, 241-254 (1907):

p	t	k
b	d	g
V	s	
m	n	ŋ
	l	
	r	
	y	

i		u
e		o
	a	

Long vowels and two-vowel clusters also occur.

Nakanai, a member of Dyen's Willaumez Linkage also on New Britain, is described in P. F. Hees, En Betrag aus den Sagen und Erzählungen der Nakanai (Neu Pommeru, Südsee), Anthropos 9, 10, pp. 34-36, 562-585, 861-887 (1915), as having the following inventory:

p	t	k
b	d	g

				i		u
v	s		h	e		o
m					a	
	r,l					

Diphthongs: ei, ea, eu,
oi, ou,
ui, ae, au,
ue, but no consonant clusters.

Stress is on the penultimate syllable, except,when the last syllable is a diphthong, it is stressed instead.

One language of Dyen's Northwest Buka Subfamily and two languages grouped with the Northwest Buka languages by Capell share the same 2 F-B over N vowel type, plus length,the same three linear distinctions for stops and the same three linear distinctions for fricatives. Teop has only /m n/ for nasals, but the additional /ŋ/ of Torau and Uruava is said to be 'new'. Teop has only one liquid, /r/, while Uruava and Torau have /l/ as well as /r/.

Teop

p	t	k		i		u
b	d	g		e		o
v	s		h		a	
m	n					
	r					

Torau and Uruava

p	t	k		i		u
b	d			e		o
v	s		h		a	
m	n	ŋ		plus length		
	r,l					

Mono, spoken in the Bougainville Straits, was 'ungrouped' in Dyen's classification. Its phonemic inventory is typologically identical with that of Torau and Uruava,that is, the same linear distinctions are made for stops, fricatives, nasals, liquids and vowels, though an additional voiced stop occurs, and the labial fricative is given as /f/ rather than /v/. Ray (1926) gives for Mono:

p	t	k		i		u
b	d	g		e		o
f	s		h		a	
m	n	ŋ				
	l					
	r					

Ray (1926) gives information on two sub-dialects of Bambatana, which is a dialect of the same language as Senga in the Choiseul Subfamily. Both dialects have four linear distinctions in stops, plus prenasalized voiced stops matching at least the three non-affricated stops; both have three linear distinctions in nasals and two liquids, but one of the dialects differs from the other in having

/v s z/ as fricatives instead of those given below and in also having a /ə /.

p	t	č	k	i		u
b	d	ǯ	g	e		o
f	s				a	
v			ɣ			
m	n		ŋ			
	l					
	r					

For Roviana of the New Georgian Subfamily, Ray (1926) shows the following inventory, which differs from that for Bambatana only in making an additional linear distinction among the fricatives (and making voiced-voiceless contrast at /s z / rather than /f v/. Voiced stops are prenasalized. Vowels may occur in clusters of two or three in Roviana, but only of two in Bambatana.

p	t	č	k		i		u
b	d	ǯ	g		e		o
	s			h		a	
v	z		ɣ				
m	n		ŋ				
	l						
	r						

Kia, spoken of the northern tip of Santa Isabel Island, is said by Capell to be closely related to Roviana. On the basis of Ray (1926) Kia's phonemic system appears to be identical with that of Roviana, except for making the voiced-voiceless contrast in fricatives at /f v/ rather than /s z/.

The inventory of one of the 'Bush' languages of Santa Isabel as given by Ray (1926) differs only in making an additional linear distinction in nasals, and in making no voiced - voiceless contrast for fricatives.

p	t	č	k		i		u
b	d	ǯ	g		e		o
f	s			h		a	
m	n	n^y	ŋ				
	l						
	r						

Lau on Malaita Island in the central Solomons belongs, with Toqabaita, to Dyen's Lauic Subfamily. Capell divides the languages of Malaita Island into four subgroups; the members of the Lauic Subfamily belong to one subgroup, Kwaraʔae (Fiu) belongs to another, Marau, spoken on Guadacanal, belongs to a third subgroup and Saʔa and Ulawa to a fourth.

The typological distinctiveness of the phonologies of (1) Lau, (2) Marau and (3) Saʔa and Ulawa, below, supports their placement in three separate subgroups; on the basis of the type of phonemic system only, Kwaraʔae would not be placed in a different subgroup than Lau.

The phonemic inventories of Lau and Kwaraʔae, as shown in Walter George Ivens, Grammar and Vocabulary of the Lau Language, Solomon Islands, Washington, Carnegie Institute of Washington, Publication 300 (1921) and A

Grammar of the Language of Kwara 'Ae, North Mala, Solomon Islands, BSOAS 6.679-700 (1930-32) are identical. Five linear distinctions are made in stops -- 5S, with a voiceless versus (prenasalized) voiced contrast made at three positions; three linear distinctions are made in fricatives -- 3 F; four linear distinctions are made in nasals -- 4 N; two linear distinctions are made in liquids -- 2 L; the vowel system consists of two front vowels opposed to two back vowels above a neutral (non-contrastive in respect to front versus back) vowel -- 2 (FB) over N:

	t	k	k^w	?	i		u
b	d	g	g^w		e		o
f	s			h		a	
m	n	ŋ	$ŋ^w$				
	r,l						

All vowels occur also long, written in the sources as identical vowel clusters. Other two-vowel clusters have /a/ as the first member. All syllables end in vowels. Ray's examples (1926) for Kwara?ae (Fiu) indicate that the voiced stops are probably prenasalized.

The phonology of Marau, as given in Walter George Ivens, A Vocabulary of the Language of Marau Sound, Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands, BSOS 6, 963 ff, (1930-32), and A Study of the Language of Marau Sound, Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands, BSOS 5 (1928-30), differs typologically from that of Lau and Kwara ?ae in making one less linear distinction in stops (besides having no additive component of voicing for stops -- 4S, one less linear distinction in fricatives --2F, two less linear distinctions in nasals — 2N, and in adding a semivowel, /w/; the vowel type is the same as that of Lau — 2(FB) over N:

p	t	k	ʔ	i		u
	s		h	e		o
m	n				a	
	r,l					
w						

All phonemes occur word initial and medial, only vowels occur word final. No consonant clusters, but vowel clusters of two and three occur.

The inventories of both the consonants and the vowels of Saʔa and Ulawa, as shown in Walter George Ivens, Dictionary and Grammar of the Language of Sa'a and Ulawa, Solomon Islands, Carnegie Institution of Washington Publication No. 253, represent different types than those of Lau and Marau, above: for consonants, 6 S (stop linear distinctions), 2F (fricative linear distinctions), 4N (nasal linear distinctions), 2L (liquid linear distinctions), and one semivowel; for vowels, 3 (FB) — a front versus a back vowel at three tongue heights.

p	p^w	t	č	k	ʔ	i	u
		s			h	e	o
m	m^w	n		ŋ		æ	a
		r,l					
w							

/č/ is $[d^r]$ before phonemes other than /i/.

Vowel clusters: /a + non-a/, /ei/, /ou/; no consonant clusters observed.

Capell's Central Solomons group includes (a) Bogotu, spoken on Santa Isabel Island, (b) Nggela, spoken on Florida Island and (c) the languages of Guadacanal, which are further divided into five subgroups. Our sample of phonologies does not include adequate representatives to distinguish all the subgroups, but Nggela is shown to be typologically distinct from Bogotu in having three, rather than four, linear distinctions in stops, and possibly three rather than four linear distinctions in nasals. The inventories of languages spoken on Guadacanal differ in showing only one, two, or three linear distinctions in fricatives, rather than four as in Bogotu and Nggela; and three, rather than four linear distinctions in nasals. Voiceless stops are matched — to a greater or lesser degree — in all by prenasalized voiced stops (shown in the inventories as voiced stops). All the Central Solomons languages in the sample share the 2 (FB) over N vowel type, but in our sample, only Bogotu and Nggela have length (long vowels contrasting with short vowels) as an additive component of the vowel system.

Bogotu, from Walter George Ivens, A Grammar of the Language of Bugotu, Ysabel Island, Solomon Islands, BSOAS 7.141 ff. (1933-35), and A Dictionary of the Language of Bugotu, Santa Isabel I., Solomon Islands, London, Royal Asiatic Society (1940):

p	t	č	k	
b	d	ǯ	g	
f	θ	s		h
v			ɣ	

m	n	n^y	ŋ	i		u
	r,l			e		o
					a	
				plus length		

Nggela (Florida), after Walter George Ivens, A Grammar of the Language of Florida, British Solomon Island, BSOAS 8. 1075 ff (1935-37), which shows three nasals /m n ŋ / rather than the four indicated in C. E. Fox, A Dictionary of the Nggela Language, Auckland, (1955):

p	t		k		i		u
b	d		g		e		o
v	s		x	h		a	
m	n	n^y	ŋ		plus length		
	r,l						

Stress is non-phonemic, occurring on penultimate syllables. All syllables are open, i.e., end in vowels.

Vaturanga, after Walter George Ivens, A Grammar of the Language of Vaturanga, Guadalcanal, British Solomon Islands, BSOAS 7. 349 ff (1933-35):

p	t	c	k		i		u
b	d	ʒ	g		e		o
v	s			h		a	
m	n		ŋ				
	r,l						

For Longgu, the following system was indicated by Ivens in A Grammar of the Language of Longgu, Guadalcanal, British Solomon Islands, BSOAS, Vol. VII (1933-35), but Capell (1962) points out that Iven's work was done on the basis of 'very badly executed' missionary translations:

p	bw	t		k	i		u
b		d		g	e		o
v	vw	θ	s			a	
m	mw	n		ŋ			
		r,l					

/k/ appears in the source as [g], but is distinguished from the prenasalized voiced /g/, but compare Inakona, below, in which three stops are distinguished in the velar positions—/k/, a voiced non-prenasalized [g] and a voiced prenasalized [ᵑg]

The Inakona system shown in Arthur Capell, The Language of Inakona, Guadalcanal, Solomon Is., JPS 39. 113-36 (1930) is:

p	t	č	k		i		u
			g	[g]	e		o
b	d		g	[ᵑg]		a	
v		s					
m	n		ŋ				
	r,l						

The system for Sugu (Suhu) indicated in P. P. Bouillon, Etude sur le dialecte de Sugu (Guadalcanal, Solomon Is.), Anthropos, Vol. X-XI (1915) is:

p	t	c		i		u
b	d		g	e		o
		s			a	
m	n		ŋ			
	r, l					
w						

In A Comparative Study of the Melanesian Languages (Cambridge, 1926), S. H. Ray gives information on two languages spoken on the islands of the Santa Cruz Archipelago; one is Vanikoro (Vanikolo) identified in 3.1 as possibly a dialect of Atago, spoken on Utupua Island; the other is simply labelled Utupua and not identified as to which of the three languages spoken on Utupua it might be.

Vanikoro:

p	p^w	t	č	k	k^w	i		u
b		d		g	g^w	ė		o
f			s				a	
v			z					
m	m^w	n	n^y	ŋ				
		l, r						
w								

Vowels occur in clusters of up to three members.

Utupua:

p		t	č	k

b		d	g	i		u
f		s		e		o
v			ɣ		a	
m	m^w	n	ŋ			
		l, r				

Vowels occur in clusters of up to three members.

The nature of the material on the languages of the Banks-Torres-Aurora-Leper's-northern Pentecost group in our sample makes even tentative phonemicizing and typologizing of their sound systems difficult. The most one can say is that all seem to make four or five linear distinctions in stops, including distinctions of labialized stops;a series generating component of prenasalization plus voicing is shown with some stops in all but Mota; the number of linear distinctions in stops for each language is matched by the number of linear distinctions in nasals; and all have two liquids.

Phonologies were taken from Robert H. Codrington, and John A. Palmer, A dictionary of the language of Mota, Sugarloaf Island,Banks'Islands, London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and Walter George Ivens, A Grammar of the Language of Lamalanga, North Raga, New Hebrides, BSOAS 9. 733-63 (1937-39), A Grammar of the Language of Lotora, Maewo, New Hebrides, Melanesia , BSOAS 10. 679-98, and A Grammar of the Language of Lobaha, Lepers' Island, New Hebrides, Melanesia, also BSOAS 10(1940-42).

Mota

p	pw	t	k	i	u

v		s	ɣ	e		o
m	mw	n	ŋ		a	
		r,l				
w						

Lo dialect of Torres Islands (Hiw-Toga-Lo)

p	pw	t	c	k		i		u
		d	ʒ	g		e	ö	o
v					h		a	
m	mw	n	n^y	ŋ				
		r,l						
w								

Lombaha dialect of Omba, Lepers' Island

	p^w	t	k		i		u
b		d			e		o
v		s	ɣ	h		a	
m	m^w	n	ŋ				
		r,l					

Lotora on Aurora Island

p	bw	t	k	i		u
b		d	g	e		o
v		s			a	
m	mw	n	ŋ			
		r,l				
w						

Lamalanga on Pentecost (Raga) Island

	b^w	t	k	
b		d	g	
v		s		h
m	m^w	n	ŋ	
		l, r		
w				

i		u
e		o
	a	

A possible distinction of [g] and [ŋg] is also indicated for Lamalanga. The phonetic nature of what is given in the charts above as labialized stops, p^w and b^w, is variously and unclearly indicated for different languages, e.g. indicated as [b^w] for Lamalanga, but as [kmb^w] for Lotora, [kp^w] for Lo.

The phonetic information on the languages of the rest of the New Hebrides given in Ray (1926) does not show a correlation of consonant types with the subgroupings of the languages in 3.1, above, since a different set of consonant distinctions is indicated for almost every language. The limited data available makes it impossible to decide which are unit phonemes and which are consonant clusters for every language, but most of these languages do seem to make extra (from the point of view of languages to the northwest of them in Melanesia) linear distinctions of labio-velar consonants (usually a nasal and a stop, e.g. m^w and b^w, with possible further phonetic complication, as indicated for Lotora and Lo above), and a linear distinction of palatal or retroflex consonants (also usually of a nasal and a stop, variously treated as clusters of n + r, r + n, and t + r, t + s, etcetera). For the sake of comparability in inventory size and arrangement, these have been indicated in the inventories given below by superscript w for labialization, by c and č for affricates and by subscript dots for retroflexion, in spite of the apparent variation in phonetic detail. Phonemic analyses of these languages based on fuller data might be expected to show more homogenity among them.

Paama, which is 'ungrouped':

p	t	k		i		u
b	d	g		e		o
v	s		h		a	
m	n	ŋ				
	l					
	r					
w		y				

Language of St. Phillip and St. James Bay on Santo Island, grouped by Capell with the rest of Santo Island and Malekula as Northwest New Hebrides:

p	t	c	i		u
v	s		e		o
m	n			a	
	l				
	r				

Tasiko (Lemaroro); the languages on Epi Island, including Tasiko, are not grouped with those of other islands, but only with each other:

p		t		k	i		u
b	b^w	d		g	e		o
v		s				a	
m	m^w	n		ŋ			
		l					
		r					
w			y				

Tongoa-Nguna, grouped with Makura and Efate as Central New Hebrides:

p	b^w	t	k	i		u
v		s		e		o
m	m^w	n	ŋ		a	
		l				
		r				
w						

Makura:

p		t		k		i		u
b	b^w	d		g		e		o
v		s			h		a	
m	m^w	n		ŋ				
		l						
		r						
w			y					

Mewun (Meaun), in the Southern subgroup of Malekula Island:

p		t	ṭ	k	i		u
b	b^w	d		g	e		o
v		s		ɣ		a	
m		n	ṇ	ŋ			
		l					
		r					
w							

Sinesip, also in the Southern subgroup of Malekula Island:

p		t		k		i		u
b	b^w	d		g		e		o
v		s	š	ɣ	h		a	
m	m^w	n	ṇ	ŋ				
		l						
		r						
w								

Atchin, in the Northern subgroup of Malekula Island, is shown by examples in Capell's Grammatical Categories in the New Hebrides, BSOS 8.189-202 (1935-37), to have at least:

p	t	č	k	i		u
b				e		o
v	s		ɣ		a	
v						
m	n		ŋ			

	l	
	r	
w		y

Nogugu, on Santo Island, also grouped in Northwest New Hebrides:

p	p^w	t	č	k	i		u
v		s			e		o
m	m^w	n				a	
		l					
		r					
w							

Uripiv, in the Northern subgroup of Malekula Island:

p	t	ṭ	č	k		i		u
b	d			g		e		o
v	s				h		a	
m	n			ŋ				
	l							
	r							
w								

Kuliviu, in the Southern subgroup of Malekula:

p	t	ṭ	č	k	i		u
b	d			g	e		o
v	s			ɣ		a	
m	n	ṇ		ŋ			

	l	
	r	
w		y

Aulua, in the Eastern subgroup of Malekula:

p		t	ṭ	č	k	i		u
b		d			g	e		o
f		s			ɣ		a	
v								
m	mʷ	n	ṇ		ŋ			
		l						
		r						
w								

Baki, on Epi Island, grouped only with other Epi Island languages:

p	pʷ	t	ṭ	č	k	i		u
b		d				e		o
v		s					a	
m	mʷ	n	ṇ	ŋ				
		l						
		r						
w				y				

Aneityum, in the southern New Hebrides, 'ungrouped':

p	t	c	k	i		u
b			g	e	ə	o
f	θ	s			a	

v			ɣ
m	n		ŋ
	r		
	l		
w		y	

Tanna-Kwamera, 'ungrouped':

p		t			k	k^w	i		u
b		d		ž			e		o
f	f^w	s				h		a	
v									
m	m^w	n	n^w	ṇ	ŋ				
		l							
		r							
w			y						

kr, br, mr also indicated.

Eromanga, also in the Southern New Hebrides:

p		t	k	k^w		i		u
b		d				e		o
f		s			h		a	
β	$β^w$		ɣ					
m		n	ŋ					
		l						
		r						
w			y					

The sound systems of the languages of New Caledonia do not show a typological homogeniety of the Northern New Caledonia languages as opposed to those of Southern New Caledonia. Some languages of both the Northern and the Southern groups have features 'characteristic' of New Caledonia and the Loyalty Islands: contrast between aspirated and unaspirated stops (as well as prenasalized voiced stops), liquids and nasals (or between voiced and voiceless nasals), distinction of retroflex or palatal nasals and stops or affricates, more than five vowel distinctions (perhaps as many as eleven), and phonemic tone or stress-accent. The following sample showing the diversity of the phonologies of the languages of New Caledonia is taken from Maurice Leenhardt, Langues et Dialectes de l' Austro-Mélanésie, Travaux et Mémoires de l' Institut d' Ethnologie XLVI, Université de Paris (1946) unless otherwise indicated.

Northern New Caledonia

Camuhi:

p	t	ṭ	c	k
b	d	ḍ	ʐ	g
v			s	
m	n		n^y	ŋ
	l, r			

Ten vowel symbols are used; at least two phonemic distinctions of tone occur with vowels.

Thuanga (tentative phonemicization of George Grace from field notes):

p	t	ṭ	c	k	ʔ
pʻ	tʻ	ṭʻ	cʻ	kʻ	
b	d	ḍ	ʒ	g	
f					h
v	ɣ̸			ɣ	
m	n		nʸ	ŋ	
m̥	n̥		n̥ʸ	ŋ̊	
	l	r			

i	u
e	o
ɛ	ɔ
a	

Vowels occur with two series generating components: length and nasalization.

Poai:

p	t	c	k
pʻ	tʻ	cʻ	kʻ
b	d	ʒ	g
f		s	x
vʻ		sʻ	xʻ
v			
m	n	nʸ	ŋ
mʻ	nʻ		

	r, l	
	rʻ	
w		y
wʻ		yʻ

Nine vowel symbols are used; at least two phonemic distinctions of tone occur with vowels.

Wamoang:

p	t		c	k
pʻ	tʻ			kʻ
b	d	ḍ	ȥ	g
f	θ		s	xʻ
v	ð			x
	l			
	lʻ			
m	n		n^y	ŋ
m	nʻ			
w				
wʻ				

Thirteen vowel symbols are used; vowels occur with at least two phonemic distinctions of tone.

Southern New Caledonia

Houailou (from Leenhardt,and Jacqueline Kasarherou, Prosodèmes de la langue mélanésinne de Houaïlou, Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris, Vol. 56, No. 1. (1961):

p	t	č		k
b	d	ǯ		g
v		s		x
m	n	n^y	ṇ	ŋ
	r,l			
	r̥			
w		y		
w̥				

Nine vowel phonemes in a 3(FCB)arrangement with series generating components of length, stress-accent, nasalization, and pharyngealization.

Haragure (Nekete) (from P. A. Colomb, Vocabulaire des mots les plus usuels de la langue de Nékété et de Thyo (cote est de la Nouvelle-Calédonie) par un missionnaire mariste, Orleans, Imp. 6, Jacob (1889):

p	t	c	k	ʔ	i	u
b	d		g		e	o
f		s	ɣ		æ	a
m	n		ŋ			
	r,l					

Kwenyi-Kapone:

p	p^w	t	c	k
		$t^ʕ$		$k^ʕ$
b	b^w	d	ʒ	g

v			s		xʻ
					x
m	mʷ	n	nʸ	ṇ	ŋ
		nʻ			
		r			
		rʻ			

Sixteen vowel symbols are used.

Loyalty Islands

Iai (tentative phonemicization of George Grace from field notes):

p		t	ṭ	č	k	
b	bʷ	d	ḍ	ǯ	g	
f		θ	ɬ	s	x	h
		ð				
m		n	ṇ	nʸ	ŋ	
m̥	m̥ʷ	n̥		n̥ʸ	ŋ̊	
		l	r			

i	ü		u
e	ö	ə	o
ɛ	œ		ɔ
		a	

plus length

[With a note that the č and ǯ, rather than c and ʒ, and phonetically front rounded vowels, rather than central, which are atypical of the area, may have been due to the influence of French on the informant.]

Dehu (Lifu):

p	t	ṭ	c	k
	d	ḍ		g
f	θ	ɬ	s	x
			s‘	
	ð		z	
m	n		n^y	ŋ
m̥	n̥		n̥^{y}	ŋ̊
	l			
	l̥			
w				
w̥				

i		u
e	ə	o
æ		a

Nengone:

p	t	ṭ	c	k
b	d	ḍ	ʒ	g
	θ		s	
			s‘	
			z	
m	n		n^y	ŋ
m‘	n‘			

	l	r
w		
wʻ		

i		u
e		ɵ
æ		ɔ
	a	

Rotuman

p	t	č	k	ʔ
f	s			h
v				
m	n		ŋ	
	l			
	r			

i		u
e		o
	a	

plus a component of rounding combined with some vowels which increases the total inventory of Rotuman vowels to a quantity not yet definitely determined.

Bauan dialect of Fijian

		t	k	i		u	
b		d	g	e		o	plus length
v	ɣ	s			a		

m	n	ŋ
	l	
	r, ^{n}r	
w		y

Voiced stops are prenasalized [^{n}b ^{n}d ^{n}g] in most positions. So also, there is a prenasalized /^{n}r/ which contrasts with /r/ and /l/.

BAUAN DIALECT OF FIJIAN

3.3. Fijian has certainly received more linguistic attention from more linguists and others than has any other one language in the Melanesian area. The early missionaries changed the status of Fijian from a preliterate to a literate language as early as 1835 (Cross and Cargill, followed by Williams, Junt, Jagger, and Hazelwood), and were assisted by a 1838 United States exploring expedition to which Horatio Emmons Hale was attached. Once the Bauan dialect of Fijian was selected as the 'only mission dialect' to be written (even though 'fifteen dialects were already known to exist'), Bauan became a Fijian standard. But scientific interest in Fijian dialects continues in later studies summarized by Albert J Schütz in the Journal of the Polynesian Society 72. 257-9 (1963):

"Once Bau became firmly established by the power of its chiefs, and its dialect established by the power of the printed word, there was little interest in other dialects for the next 75 years. The only important publication during this period was the Reverend Joseph Waterhouse's King and People of Fiji: 'Containing a life of Cakobau; with notices of the Fijiens, their manners, customs, and superstitions, previous to the great religious reformation in 1854.' Waterhouse, who had served as a missionary for 14 years, proposed that Fiji was composed of an aboriginal and an immigrant race, using a list of 18 'key-words' to show the difference between western and eastern dialects."

"In 1876, A. S. Gatschet elicited a vocabulary and fragments of meke (dance) texts form a speaker of one of the 'hill dialects' of Fiji. The texts were edited and expanded by the Rev. Lorimer Fison. The completed material, published as 'Specimens of Fijian Dialects', consisted of nine *meke* texts and a fable in seven dialects. From Fison's grammatical notes, Gatschet concluded that most of the Fijian dialects would 'fall in more or less with the two typical specimens, Bau and Nadroga'. Even at this time, the influence of Bau on the other dialects was noted. 'Probably an excessive Bau element has crept into some of the specimens, owing to the circumstance that they were obtained from young men, whose speech approximates more to Bau than that of the older men.' Additional comments on dialects were gleaned from Hale."

"Notes on lexical and phonetic variations in Vanua Levu dialects were collected by A. Hocart about 1912, but did not appear until 1952 in the posthumously published *Northern States of Fiji*."

"In 1935, Buell H. Quain began a ten-months' anthropological study of the Bau area of Vanua Levu. Twenty-three-year-old Quain, who had studied with Linton, Boas, and Benedict, conducted what he described as a 'four-week survey of Vanua Levu linguistics'. Because of the large territory to cover in a short time, the amount of data he collected is limited. But the material he did gather is of the same excellent quality as the rest of his anthropological data. His map of phonetic correspondences for the island is the first application of modern methods of dialect geography to Fiji."

"The first systematic collection of Fijian dialect material was done by A. Capell. Part of this work appeared in 1941 as an appendix to his *New Fijian Dictionary* and shows phonetic and pronominal correspondences among about fifteen dialects from Viti Levu, Vanua Levu, Kadavu, Lau, and Yasawa. Some grammatical discussions appeared in Capell and Lester, 1941. They are known to have collected material on thirty dialects, but most of it is still unpublished."

"Using Capell's word and sentence list, Bruce Biggs compiled a glossary of three Ba dialects and added grammatical notes to one of them. The same list was used to elicit a vocabulary from Nailawa in Ra, and a vocabulary and phrases from Sigatoka in Nadroga. This material, gathered from 1942-45, appears in an adaptation of Bauan orthography, the only attempt at a phonetic transcription being the marking of so-called 'long'vowels."

"In 1953, Major Rowland Raven-Hart visited Nabukeru village in the Yasawa group for general anthropological study. An expert in several languages as well as in such varied fields as canoeing, Torres Strait music, short-wave radio transmission, and engineering, Raven-Hart was able to compare his material with existing materials of Biggs, Capell, and Churchward to produce a word list and grammatical sketch of the Nabukeru dialect."

'The dialect survey with the finest-grained geographical coverage is G. B. Milner's 1954 questionnaire. It consists of ten sentences in Bauan to be translated, and is designed to show certain phonetic, grammatical, and lexical differences between 'eastern' and 'western'dialects. Those returns that were conscientiously completed fulfill this purpose, but it would be impossible to define dialect boundaries on the basis of such limited material. When organized, this material should provide the basis for a careful analysis of the distribution of a number of dialectal features."

"At the time of the writer's own survey, Aubrey Parke was completing a grammar and a word list of the Navatu dialect in Ra; material for a study of Navatu kinship terms; and word lists for certain Ra and Ba dialects. He was also beginning to collect word lists from the Sigatoka area, planning eventually to produce a grammar of that dialect."

The Bauan dialect of Fijian is written in a spelling orthography which differs from the letters given above (3.2) for the Fijian sound system at only a few points.

The spelling uses the letter / c / to write interdental fricative / ð /.

In the spelling orthography two letters, dr, are used to write prenasalized / ^{n}r /, a single phoneme.

Both ways of writing show prenasalized [^{n}b] and [^{n}d] by the letters [b d], respectively; but the spelling orthography uses one letter, q (instead of / g /) for the prenasalized [ng], which leaves the letter, g, leftover for representing velar nasal / ŋ /.

Fijian sentences which follow are numbered successively; for each sentence the English free translation is followed by the Bauan spelling orthography for Fijian (and where Churchward or Milner differ in the specification of vowel length from that of Cammack and Schütz, the latter are cited, on the assumption that the difference does not reflect a difference of hearing length so much as a difference in a slower or more formal pronunciation as against a more natural speed of talking in Fijian). Under the Fijian there appears a literal translation in which square brackets enclose what are phrases in the Fijian morphemes corresponding to the English gloss. From the phrasing of Fijian, indirectly indicated in this way, it is possible to state criteria for the various sentence profiles. This also permits a running comment on the interior of phrases after each sentence. In such comment, what is called major morpheme (and symbolized by cap M) is the equivalent of what the grammars call a 'base'; what is called a minor morpheme (and symbolized by lower case m) or a sequence of minor morphemes (m's) is the equivalent not only of what the grammars call a 'particle' but also what is regarded as a suffix (m after M) or a prefix (m before M) in grammars which do not always agree as to whether a given minor morpheme is a prefix (as the so-called 'preformative' i-) or a suffix (the same -i written after a 'particle'). Within the phrase bracket, a gloss gives a literal translation of the Fijian morpheme (M or m) or 'word' or word-like sequence of more than one morpheme. The latter are enclosed in parentheses within the phrase brackets, as (M M), for reduplication and compounds or (modified modifier) sequences in Fijian, or as sequences of minor morphemes (m's), or sequences including major morphemes and affixes relevant to the syntactic profiles. The point of departure in the comment following the sentences is the syntactic profiles which are stated in terms of the function of the phrases. Information about the phrases' interior is given only when it is relevant to the function of the phrase in determining the sentence profile. A 'part of speech' treatment for morphemes (and word-like morpheme sequences) would also be possible; but is not necessary in sentence profile analysis of Fijian. Nor is it necessary to treat a [V phrase] as a phrase that can be always expanded to contain a nominal.

Profile I sentences reflect sequences of two phrases functioning as Verb [V phrase] and Subject [S phrase] , while Profile II sentences reflect sequences of two phrases functioning as Verb-transitive [Vt phrase] and Object [O phrase] . The first phrase in both Profile I and Profile II sentences is introduced by minor morphemes, / e / glossed is or / sa /, also glossed is (is indeed); the second phrase (in both Profile I and Profile II sentences) is introduced by minor morphemes, / na / glossed the or / ko /, also glossed the. The voice of the first phrase, functioning as Verb, determines whether the second phrase will function as Object (after [Vt phrase]) or Subject (after other [V phrase]). Most selfsufficient sentences of Profile I and II include two phrases; sentences (6) and (8) below are unusual in being reduced to [V phrase] alone.

(1) *The child is asleep.*

sa moce na gone

[*is* *sleep*] [*the* *child*]

(2) *The net is short.*

e leka-leka na lawa

[*is* (*short-short*)] [*the* *net*]

Each phrase is introduced by a minor morpheme, small m, followed by a major morpheme, capital M. Sentence (1) can be represented as [m M] [m M], in which the minor morpheme glossed *is* is / sa /. Sentence (2) is then [m (M-M)] [m M], in which the minor morpheme glossed *is* turns out to be / e / rather than / sa /. In second phrases of both sentences (1) and (2), the minor morpheme that introduces the phrase is / na /, glossed *the*. A given major morpheme might be glossed *day* after the minor morpheme for *the*, but *is drying* after the morpheme glossed *is* (whether / e / or / sa /). The latter might be glossed *is indeed.*

(3) *There are three canoes.*

e tolu na waqa

[*is* *three*] [*the* *canoe*]

(4) *Here's a canoe.*

e dua na waqa

[*is* *one*] [*the* *canoe*]

(5) *There is a canoe available.*

sa dua na waqa

[*is* *one*] [*the* *canoe*]

The free translation for sentence (5) probably overstates in English the difference between Fijian sentences (4) and (5), marked by selection of minor morpheme / e / in (4), but / sa / in (5). Sentences (3), (4), (5) share phrase interior [m M] [m M], with the first phrase functioning as a quantifier Verb phrase, and the second as Subject phrase. It is the Subject that is quantified, and cultural context that generally determines whether the Subject is merely existing, or is available for use.

(6) *He sleeps a long time.*

sa moce balavu

[*is* (*sleep* *long time*)]

Subject is specified in sentence (1), above, but not here in (6). The phrase interior of (6) is [m M].

(7) *The nights are hot.*

e kata-kata na vei bogi

[*is* (*hot-hot*)] [*the* *reciprocal* *night*]

The phrase interiors are [m (M-M)] [m m M]; the second phrase is introduced by a minor morpheme, / na /, followed by another minor morpheme / vei / (often written as a 'prefix') which marks *plural* as well as *reciprocal* in respect to the major morpheme (M) which is the phrase nucleus of the Subject phrase. But in sentence (8), following, the minor morpheme / vei / marks *reciprocal* (and not necessarily *plural*). In the spelling orthography, / vei / is sometimes written as a 'prefix' and sometimes as a separate 'word'.

(8) *He wants to mate.*

sa via vei cai

[*is* *desiderative* *reciprocal* *mate*]

Subject is not specified, but context permits only third person. The phrase interior of (8) is [m $\frac{m}{M}$ m M]. The first minor morpheme in this phrase, / sa /, introduces the Verb phrase. The next, $\frac{m}{M}$ for / via / *desiderative*, functions here as a minor morpheme—as a verb complement—but in other sentences may function as phrase nucleus ($\frac{M}{m}$). The minor morpheme glossed *reciprocal* appears immediately before the phrase nucleus again, as in sentence (7), above—though in sentence (7) the phrase functions as Subject, while in sentence (8) the phrase with / vei / functions as Verb.

(9) *The restaurant is good.*

sa vinaka na vale ni kana

[*is* *good*] [*the* *house* *of* *food*]

The interior of the second or Subject phrase is [m M m M], with two major morphemes. The phrase is introduced by one minor morpheme, / na /, and the two major morphemes are related to each other by another minor morpheme / ni /, which in other sentences may function as an introducer of dependent verb phrase. It is tempting to regard / ni kana / *of eat*, as a dependent verb phrase embedded in the Subject phrase, but such an analysis would not be possible in other Subject phrases as [na qito ni gone] *the game of the child*.

(10) *The young men's canoe is lost.*

sa yali na nodratou waqa na couravou

[*is* *lost*] [*the* (*their*) *canoe* *the* (*young man*)]

The interior of the Subject phrase is [m (m's) M m (M)], with two major morphemes. The first M is preceded by minor morpheme phrase introducer and by a person marker sequence of minor morphemes (m's) that are glossed (*their*); the second (M) is preceded by a repetition of the phrase introducer / na / which, in this order—after morphemes for *the person-marker Subject*—introduces an embedded phrase that is in appositional relationship to the person-marker. That is to say, what is glossed (*their*) is in apposition to what is glossed *the young man*.

(11) The land of the Fijians is good.

sa	vinaka	na	nodra	vanua	na	gone	ni	Viti
[is	good]	[the	(their)	land	the	child	of	Fiji]

The interior of the Subject phrase is [m (m's) M m M m M], with three major morphemes, each with its own minor morpheme introducer—first, [m (m's) M ...] for the (their) land, followed by phrase embedded [... m M] for the child which is in apposition to the person-marker (their) (as in sentence (10), above), followed by an embedded phrase [... m M] introduced by the minor morpheme glossed of (as in sentence (9), above). But the Subject phrase in sentence (9) does not include a person-marker sequence before Subject, followed by an embedded appositional phrase, as do the Subject phrases in sentences (10) and (11). And sentence (10) does not include an embedded phrase introduced by minor morpheme marking of, as do sentences (9) and (11).

(12) The kava cup is empty.

sa	maca	na	bilo	ni	yaqona
[is	empty]	[the	cup	of	kava]

(13) The cup of kava is good.

sa	vinaka	na	bilo	yaqona
[is	good]	[the	(cup	kava)]

The Verb phrases in sentences (12) and (13) are identical in structure; the difference in structure of the following Subject phrases yields a reference to container in sentence (12) and to contents in sentence (13). In sentence (12), the interior of the Subject phrase is [m M m M]—exactly like the interior of the subject phrase in sentence (9), above. In sentence (13), the interior of the Subject phrase also includes two major morphemes--[m (M M)]—but they are in a modified-modifier contiguous order which might read in English as *the cupped kava.*

(14) *The sea is (in general) rough.*

e levu tū na ua

[*is* *big* *generally*] [*the* *wave*]

The interior of the first or Verb phrase is $[m\ M\ \frac{m}{M}]$, with the last morpheme in the phrase, / tū /, functioning as a verb complement after the phrase nucleus. When / tū / functions as a minor $(\frac{m}{M})$, as here and in sentence (15), it is glossed *generally*; when the same morpheme functions as a major morpheme $(\frac{M}{m})$—i.e. as phrase nucleus—it is glossed *situated*, as in sentence (16), below.

(15) *There are two whale's teeth (no more are expected).*

sa rua tū na tabue

[*is* *two* *generally*] [*the* *whale-tooth*]

The interior of the Verb phrase is structurally identical with that of sentence (14), above, though it would be possible (in a 'part of speech' treatment) to show that since /levu/ *big* and /rua/ *two* have different restrictions in other phrases, they represent different 'parts of speech'.

(16) *There are two men standing over there.*

e tū koyā e rua na tamata

[*is* *situated* *yonder*] [*is* *two* *the* *man*]

The interior of the Verb phrase is $[m\ \frac{M}{m}\ m]$; here /tū/ functions as the phrase nucleus, instead of verb complement as in sentence (14) and (15); and here the verb complement /koyā/ follows. The interior of the Subject phrase reflects [m M m M], with two major morphemes, since the quantifier phrase is embedded in the Subject phrase before the phrase introducer and Subject /na tamata/; /na/ generally appears in phrase initial but may appear (or appear again) in phrase medial, as after the sequence glossed *the person-marker Subject* in sentences (10) and (11), above. The quantifier phrase is separable, as a phrase from other phrases in the sentence when it is the first phrase in the sentence.

(17) There is no water.

e sega na wai

[is none] [the water]

Both the Verb phrase and the following Subject phrase reflect [m M], with appropriate minor morphemes introducing the respective phrases whose centers are major morphemes (M). This simple structure is also reflected in the following sentence.

(18) He is good.

e vinaka ko koya

[is good] [the 3rd person marker]

But the minor morpheme introducing the Subject phrase is /ko/ rather than /na/; in a 'part of speech' treatment of Fijian it would be possible to distinguish between 'common nouns' which are introduced by /na/ (the vast majority), and others which are introduced by /ko/, as phrases which specify place names, personal names, titles, kinship terms, and the person marker /koya/. However, there is some overlap—that is, there are phrases which may be introduced either by /ko/ or by /na/, with specialization in message. Thus, the phrase for world as terrestial sphere is introduced by /na/—[na vura-vura]; but the phrase for inhabitants of the world is introduced by /ko/—[ko vura-vura]; and in both phrases /vura/ is glossed arrive or emerge. So also, in some phrases, kinship terms functioning as the major morpheme nucleus may be introduced either by /ko/, as in sentence (19), following, or by /na/, as in sentence (20).

(19) Where is Father?

e	tiko	evei	ko	tama-qu
[is	continuative	(where)]	[the	(father-my)]

The use of the /ko/ introducer in second or Subject phrase is permissible for a child speaking at home, and this usage is said to be analogous to first-name reference to parent in English.

(20) Where is my father?

e	tiko	evei	na	tama-qu
[is	continuative	(where)]	[the	(father-my)]

The use of the /na/ introducer in the Subject phrase is appropriate for a child speaking to strangers, and this usage is said to mark a higher degree of formality and politeness than that shown in sentence (19). In both (19) and (20) /tiko/ functions as a minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$) in the Verb phrase, and is glossed continuative. In sentence (21), the same morpheme, reduplicated, functions as a major morpheme ($\frac{M}{m}$), as the nucleus of the verb phrase, and is glossed sit.

(21) The moon is setting.

sa	vaka	tiko-tiko	na	bula
[is	intensifier	(sit-sit)]	[the	moon]

The Verb phrase nucleus here includes reduplicated morphemes functioning as major morpheme ($\frac{M}{m} - \frac{M}{m}$). In the following sentence, the verb phrase includes two major morphemes in modified-modifier order—[m (M M)].

(22) He is a good child.

e	gone	vinaka	ko	koya
[is	(child	good)]	[the	3rd person]

The Subject phrase is introduced by /ko/ when the person marker functions as subject or object, but not when it functions as possessor, as in sentences

(10) and (11) above, and (23), following, where the Subject phrases are introduced by /na/.

(23) My box is lost.

sa	yali	na	no-qu	kato
[is	lost]	[the	(classifier-my)	box]

Person and number of possessor are marked by minor morphemes that are suffixed to one of three classifiers, as /no-/ in the Subject phrase of this sentence and of sentences (10) and (11), above. The classifier /no-/ is very general or neutral and the sequence /no-/ plus possessor suffixes is appropriate before major morpheme for artifacts, as box (23), canoe (10), as well as land (11), and much else that is alienable. But before major morphemes specifying what is edible (solid food for eating rather than planting or selling) or an internal quality of person or thing, the classifier /ke-/ plus possessor suffixes is appropriate; and before those specifying what is drinkable (including container as well as contents, as liquid, oysters, and sugar), the classifier /me-/ plus possessor suffixes is appropriate; and the person and number minor morphemes are suffixed directly to major morphemes specifying what is inalienable as body parts, plant parts and different terms for humans, as kinship terms—e.g. (father-my) in sentences (19) and (20) above, in phrases which may be introduced by either /na/ or /ko/. Similarly, for some major morphemes, as yaqona kava, or dalo taro, more than one classifier may be appropriate, as the alienable classifier /no-/ in reference to kava that is being grown or sold, but the drinkable classifier /me-/ in reference to kava that is being drunk; or again as the alienable classifier /no-/ in reference to taro that is growing in a patch, but the edible classifier /ke-/ in reference to taro that is to be eaten. The possessor paradigms, accordingly, include a paradigmatic constant—the /no-/ or /ke-/ or /me-/ or zero constant which marks the classifier, and paradigmatic variables which distinguish singular, dual, paucal, and plural for third person (his, their two, their few, their many); for second person (your, your two, your few, your many); and for first person singular (my); and, with further distinction of inclusive vs. exclusive distinctions, for first person dual (our, your and mine vs. our, his and mine), and paucal (our few, including or excluding yours), and plural (our many, including or excluding yours). The same possessor suffix, /-qu/ my, appears after the classifier paradigmatic constant /no-/ in sentence (23) as after the major morpheme for father (zero classifier) in sentences (19) and (20), above. And so in general, but with some slight asymmetries in some combinations of paradigmatic constant and possessor suffixes.

It is the classifiers or 'genders' or paradigmatic constants for possessor paradigms that may be involved in Profile I sentences, rather than person-marker paradigms for Subject and Object phrases which are involved in Profile III and Profile IV sentences, below. And the classifier appropriate for the phrase nucleus of the Subject phrase in Profile I sentences is marked only when a possessor person relationship is involved. It is not so involved in the simple Profile I sentences (24), (25), and (26).

(24) This clock is about to stop.

sa	via	mate	na	kaloko	oqō
[is	desiderative	die]	[the	clock	here]

(25) Fiji is hot.

e	kata-kata	ko	Viti
[is	(hot-hot)]	[the	Fiji]

(26) Suva is large.

e	levu	ko	Suva
[is	big]	[the	Suva]

(27) A child is asleep.

e	moce	e	dua	na	gone
[is	asleep]	[is	one	the	child]

This exemplifies a Profile I sentence, with quantifier Verb phrase embedded in the Subject phrase.

Profile II is rare. In such sentences, a transitive Verb phrase is followed by an Object phrase, in a sentence in which the Subject is not specified.

(28) He has taken the book.

a	sa	taura	na	ivola
[past	is	(take hold of it)]	[the	(book)]

The phrase interior of the first or [Vt phrase] is [m m (M)], with two minor morphemes preceding the phrase nucleus (M)—that marking past before the phrase introducer /sa/. Though /e/ as phrase introducer is always in phrase initial, /sa/ may follow another minor morpheme (or a sequence of (m's), as embedded subject person marker in Profiles III and IV, below.

Profiles III and IV are defined as sentences which may be no longer than a single phrase that includes—beside phrase nucleus major morpheme and phrase introducer—an embedded subject, which is an anaphoric person marker ('pronoun'). The person marker, generally a sequence of minor morphemes (m's), functions as Subject in both of these profiles, III and IV, which are distinguished only by voice specification. In Profile III, intransitive voice is specified; in Profile IV, transitive voice. Minor morpheme phrase introducers are the same as those in Profiles I and II; besides, the embedded subject constitutes a phrase introducer in Profiles III and IV.

(29) *They're going.*

e-ra lako

[(*they*) *go*]

The embedded subject might be glossed *is-they* since /e/, when it is pronounced in careful speech, functions as a Verb phrase introducer before the embedded subject marker /ra/ *they*. However, the latter can function also as a Verb phrase introducer and, with further redundancy, the embedded subject marker may be followed by another verb phrase introducer, which in some sentences, as (30) following, marks completion.

(30) *They've gone.*

e-ra sa lako

[(*they*) *is* *go*]

The Verb phrase introducer, /sa/, is more often found after the embedded subject marker than before it. The Subject marker, /ra/, in sentences (29) and (30) is for *they many*. In the next two sentences, the embedded subject marker sequence for 3rd person is restricted in number, /-ra-u/ for *they dual* (31), and /-ra-tou/ for *they few* (32).

(31) *They are off now* (in the sense of *They will be off presently*).

erau lako oqō

[(*they 2*) *go* *now*]

The phrase nucleus major morpheme (M for *go*) is followed by a minor morpheme (m) which specifies non-past tense in Verb phrase, but *here* in reference to place of 1st person. Parallel minor morphemes are /oqori/ for *recent past* in Verb phrases, but *there* in reference to place of 2nd person; and /oyā/ or /koyā/ for *distant past* in Verb phrase, but *yonder* in reference to place of

3rd person.

(32) They go at once.

eratou lako sara

[(they few) go intensive]

(33) They are drinking.

eratou gunu

[(they few) drink]

(34) They are kava-drinking.

eratou gunu yaqona

[(they few) (drink kava)]

The free translation changes the order of the Fijian intransitive Verb compound to kava-drinking, on the analogy of English hay-making or road-making.

(35) They come.

erau lako mai

[(they 2) go hither]

(36) They go.

erau lako yani

[(they 2) go away]

(37) Do sit down!

nī dabe mada

[(you pl) sit please do]

(38) I will go.

au na lako

[I will go]

In sentences (30) and (38), a minor morpheme after the embedded subject marker precedes the major morpheme phrase nucleus; in sentences (31), (32), (35), (36), (37), however, the minor morpheme that functions as a verb complement follows the major morpheme phrase nucleus.

(39) We're hungry.

eda via kana
[(we pl incl) desiderative eat]

Here /via/ desiderative functions as a minor morpheme $(\frac{m}{M})$ before the phrase nucleus, as it does in such phrases as [desiderative drink] for thirsty and [desiderative sleep] for sleepy; but in other phrases /via/ functions as a major morpheme $(\frac{M}{m})$.

Profile IV is less commonly encountered in self-sufficient sentences than Profile III, above. If Profile III is [(m's) V], then Profile IV is [(m's) Vt]—that is, marked for transitive voice. Compare sentence (40), following, with sentences (33) and (34), above, and with sentences (41), (42), and (43), below.

(40) They drink it.

eratou gunuva
[(they few) (drink Vt)]

In sentence (33), the phrase nucleus is /gunu/; here in sentence (40) the phrase nucleus is expanded to /gunuv-/, and followed by a transitive suffix -a. In more complex sentences, the first profile (or 'clause') is introduced by minor morphemes /sa/ or /e/; after such a profile, however, it is possible to have a Dependent profile (or 'clause') which, is introduced by Dependent (Dep) minor morpheme introducer /ka/ and is; but the translation makes this seem to be analogous to a coordinate rather than a Dependent clause in English. However, in Fijian, profiles introduced by /ka/ do not ever appear as the first profile of a sentence. Thus, sentences (41), (42) and (43) exemplify Profile

III before Dep III: the first profile with major morpheme nucleus (M for eat) precedes a second profile, introduced by Dep minor morpheme /ka/, which includes another major morpheme nucleus (M for drink). If the order were to be inverted, the independent phrase introducer /e/ would appear before M for drink and the Dep minor morpheme /ka/ would appear before M for eat. (Hence the rule, incidentally, that a quantifier phrase as /e dua/ is one functions as a Verb phrase only when it is the first phrase in a sentence, though it may be embedded in subsequent Subject and Object phrases.)

(41) They ate and they drank.

e-ra kana ka ra gunu

[(is-they) eat] [and is they drink]

The redundant use of two Verb phrase introducers, /ka/ and /sa/, in the second or Dep profile of sentence (42), following, marks completion and emphasis.

(42) They have eaten and drunk well.

e-ra kana ka ra sa gunu

[(is-they) eat] [and is they is drink]

Perhaps additional emphasis is obtained when both the first and the following Dep profiles are redundantly introduced, as in (43).

(43) They have eaten well and drunk well.

e-ra sa kana ka ra sa gunu

[(is-they) is eat] [and is they is drink]

Profile V is defined as an extension of one of the other profiles. One or more phrases of the kind and order characterized in the other profiles may be extended by a phrase which specifies Location—[L phrase]; or by a phrase which specifies Time—[T phrase]; or specifies Reciprocal Object—[RO phrase], or Indirect Object—[IO phrase]—that is to say, any non-direct Object. In general, the additional phrases in Profile V sentences are introduced by one minor morpheme or by a sequence of two minor morhemes.

(44) I live in this house (where I am).

au sa tiko e na vale oqō

[I is stay] [in the house here near speaker]

Sentence (44) is extended by a following Location phrase, introduced by two minor morphemes /e/ and /na/. The embedded subject Verb phrase (in Profile III before extension) includes /tiko/ functioning as major morpheme phrase nucleus ($\frac{M}{m}$), but in sentence (45), following, /tiko/ progressive functions as a verb complement and hence as minor morpheme ($\frac{m}{M}$).

(45) I'm drinking right now.

au sa gunu tiko

[I is drink progressive]

This is a Profile III sentence which could be extended by addition of a Location phrase, as in sentence (44), above.

(46) I'm going to a village.

au sa lako ki na ∂ua na koro

[I is go] [to the one the village]

Profile III embedded subject Verb phrase (with major morpheme for go as phrase nucleus) is exemplified in sentences (29), (30), (31), (32), (35), and (36), above. Here, in Profile V extension, the Verb phrase is followed by a Location phrase, introduced by minor morphemes /ki/ and /na/ before quantifier; then /na/ appears again before the major morpheme for village; in effect [the one] is embedded in the phrase centering in [the village].

(47) Sam is in New Zealand (somewhere or other).

e tū ko Samu mai Niu Siladi

[is situated] [the Sam] [in New Zealand]

The intransitive Verb phrase followed by Subject phrase is exemplified as Profile I (with /tū/ situated also functioning as Verb phrase nucleus in sentence (16), above). Here in Profile V extension, the Subject phrase is followed by Location phrase, introduced by the minor morpheme /mai/.

(48) Let's go to Suva.

daru lako mada ki Suva

[(we incl dual) go please do] [to Suva]

The Subject embedded Verb phrase is exemplified as Profile III here, in Profile V extension, the Verb phrase is followed by Location phrase, introduced by /ki/.

(49) There is a coconut-tree in Serua.

e tū e dua na vuniniu mai Sèrua

[is situated] [is one the (coconut-tree)] [in Serua]

The intransitive Verb phrase followed by Subject phrase is exemplified as Profile I above—with the Subject phrase including embedded quantifier phrase in sentences (16) and (27), above, as also here in (49) which, however, is extended by a following Location phrase introduced by minor morpheme /mai/.

(50) There's a lot of sweat on his back, his hands, and also on his legs.

e levu na buno e daku-na e liga-na e yava-na

[is big] [the sweat] [on (back-his)] [on (hand-his)][on (leg-his)

tale gā

also just]

Here the Profile I [V phrase] precedes [S phrase], and in Profile V extension, the Subject phrase is followed by three successive Location phrases, each introduced by the minor morpheme /e/. Sentence (51), following, also shows a Profile V extension of Profile I; however, the Location phrase appears between the intransitive Verb phrase and the Subject phrase.

(51) John is going to the house.

sa lako tiko ki na vale ko Jone
[is go progressive] [to the house] [the John]

And in general, sentences with Profile V extension (whether by addition of Location phrase, Time phrase, or non-direct Object phrase), show greater diversity of relative ordering among phrases—and permit more non-constrastive syntax reordering of phrases—than do other sentence profiles.

(52) We came here yesterday.

keitou a lako mai ki kē e nanoa
[(we excl. few) past go hither] [to here] [(yesterday)]

The subject embedded Verb phrase is exemplified as Profile III above. Here the Verb phrase is followed, in Profile V extension, both by a Location phrase and by a Time phrase.

(53) They fight with the enemy.

era vala kei na meca
[(they) fight] [with the enemy]

The first or embedded subject Verb phrase could stand alone as a Profile III sentence, but here in Profile V extension it is followed by a Reciprocal Object phrase introduced by two minor morphemes /kei/ and /na/.

(54) He told us.

e ā tukuna vei kedaru
[is past (tell Vt)] [to (us dual)]

The transitive Verb phrase without specification of direct Object would be like a reduced version of sentence (28), above—an example of Profile II. Here, in Profile V extension, the Indirect Object phrase follows, introduced by /vei/. The Indirect Object phrase appears only after transitive Verb phrase, as in the preceding sentence. With intransitive sentences, as He told (someone) about us—that is, He was us-telling someone, the Profile I sentence appears, with reduced intransitive verb compound (us-telling),

e ā tukuni kedaru

[is past (tell us dual)]; this is parallel to (Fiji-see) in (70), to (him-see) in (71), and to (us-ask) in sentence (72), below.

Profiles VI and VII are defined as sentences in which the initial phrase, introduced by /na/ or /ko/ minor morpheme, is the Comment phrase before a Topic phrase that is also introduced by /na/ or /ko/. In Profile VI the relation between the major morpheme phrase nucleus of the Topic and the major morpheme (M) of the preceding Comment is equational, [m M] = [m M]. In Profile VII, the second major morpheme of the Topic phrase is related as possessor to what is quantified in the preceding Comment phrase.

The sentences following, (55) and (56), exemplify Profile VI.

(55) What's this thing?

na ~ a cava na ka oqō

[the what] [the thing here near speaker]

The Comment phrase, introduced by /na/, which may appear as /a/ in utterance initial, has as its phrase nucleus the interrogative morpheme /cava/. The Topic phrase is also introduced by /na/. In general, a single /na/ introduces phrases which are either Subject phrase or Object phrase, with Object phrase distinguished from Subject phrase by the voice of the Verb phrase. But Profile

VI sentences are precisely sentences without Verb phrase. The relationship between the Comment introduced by /na/ (or /ko/) and the Topic Subject phrase, also introduced by /na/ (or /ko/) is equational--as though one were to say in English (but with copula), *The thing here is what?*

(56) *They are John and Mary.*

ko	irau	ko	Jone	kei	Mere	oqō
[the	(they 2)]	[the	John	and	Mary]	[here]

Both the Comment phrase and the Topic phrase are introduced by /ko/, rather than /na, since /ko/ appears before person markers and person's names. In the Profile V extension, there is no Location phrase introducer before /oqō/; kowever, like other Profile V extensions, this Location phrase may be reordered in non-contrastive syntax--it may appear before the Comment-Topic phrases rather than after them.

Sentences following, (57), (58), and (59), exemplify Profile VII, which does not include all sentences in which a major morphene specifying a numeral functions as nucleus of an intransitive Verb phrase; for example, not included are Profile I sentences (3), (4), (5), (15), above. Profile VII sentences are defined as including (in the phrase or phrases after the quantified Verb phrase) specification that the Topic is concerned with ownership; then the quantity owned is specified in the prior Comment phrase.

(57) *The villagers have three boats.*

e	tolu	na	nodratou	waqa	na	lewe	ni	koro
[is	three]	[the	their few	boat	the	human	of	village]

The interior of the Topic phrase is m (m's) M m M m M , with three major morphenes (M). The first M is preceded by a phrase introducer, /na/, and by a minor morphene sequence (m's) glossed (their few). The second M is preceded.

by the same phrase introducer, /na/, which here introduces an embedded phrase that is in appositional relationship to the minor morphemes (m's) glossed (their few) in the first or [m (m's) M ...] part of the Topic phrase. The third M (for village) is related to the second M (for human) by a minor morpheme, /ni/, glossed of. The structure of the first two parts of the Topic phrase is the same as that of the whole Subject phrase in sentence (10). The last two parts of the Topic phrase are structurally the same as that of the whole Subject phrase in sentence (9). All three parts of the Topic phrase are structurally identical with the Subject phrase in sentence (11). But in the Topic of our sentence here (57), it is not the first part of the phrase (M for boat) but rather the second part, (M for human), or the second and third part together (m M m M for villagers) that functions as possessor of what is quantified in the prior Verb phrase. On the other hand, in sentences (9), (10), and (11) it is the first part of the Subject phrase (the first M for home, canoe, and land, respectively) that represents the central Subject concerning which comment is made in the prior Verb phrases—is good, is lost, is good, respectively.

(58) The man has a new lamp.

e	dua	na	nona	cina	vou	na	tamata
[is	one]	[the	(his)	(lamp	new)	the	man]

The interior of the Topic phrase is [m (m's) (M M) m M], with two major morpheme parts, the first in parentheses (the usual modified-modifier order, taken as a unit), before M (for man). Each major morpheme part of the Topic phrase is introduced by the minor morpheme /na/. It is not the first part of the Topic phrase, but rather the second part (M for man) that functions as possessor of what is quantified in the prior Comment phrase.

(59) Mary has a plate.

sa	dua	na	veleti	nei	Mere
[*is*	*one*]	[*the*	*plate*	*of*	*Mary*]

The interior of the Topic phrase reflects [m M m M], with two major morphemes. It is the major morpheme in the second part of the Topic phrase (M for *Mary*) that functions as possessor of what is quantified in the prior Comment phrase. The first major morpheme in the Topic phrase (M for *plate*) is introduced by /na/; the relationship between this M (for *plate*) and the second M (for *Mary*) is marked by /nei/ *of* (before a person's name). But compare /ni/ *of* in sentence (57), above. This selection—/nei/ versus /ni/ for *of*—is parallel to /ko/ versus /na/ for introducing Subject or Object phrases in Exp. III and Exp. IV following. Those Subject or Object phrases that are introduced by the so-called 'proper article' /ko/ *the* (a minor morpheme) before major morpheme (M) may be related to following major morphemes by such minor morphemes as /nei/ *of*, /kei/ *and*, *with*. But Subject or Object phrases that are introduced by the more common or so-called 'common article' /na/ *the* (a minor morpheme) before major morpheme (M) may be related to following major morphemes by minor morphemes that are generally one vowel shorter—/ni/ for *of* instead of /nei/, and so on.

Exp-III and Exp-IV are expanded profiles. They are, in one sense, expansions of Profiles III and IV, but externally appear more similar to Profiles I and II. In the latter—in Profile I and Profile II sentences—the Verb phrase does not include specification of person, but the voice of the Verb phrase determines whether the following phrase (introduced by /na/ or /ko/) will function as Subject phrase or Object phrase. In Profile Exp-III and Exp-IV sentences, as in Profile III and IV sentences, a subject is embedded in the Verb phrase, and for the latter (III and IV), this is the only specification of Subject. But in Profiles Exp-III and Exp-IV (as well as Exp-IV+ [S phrase]), the Subject may be twice specified—once by embedded person markers in sequence with (or constituting) Verb phrase introducer; and again, whenever a Subject phrase follows the Verb phrase for a second Subject specification which is in concordance with the first Subject specification embedded in the Verb phrase. The Subject phrase—and the Object phrase as well—may be introduced by /ko/ for names, titles, occupations, kinship terms, and certain place names; or may be introduced by /na/ for other Subjects and Objects. The voice of the subject embedded Verb phrase determines whether the following phrase functions as Subject, as in Profile Dep-III, or as Object, as in Profile Exp-IV.

(60) *Mosese and Masara are asleep.*

erau	moce	Mōsese	kei	Masara
[(they 2)	sleep]	[Mosese	and	Masara]

The second or Subject phrase can optionally be introduced by /ko/ *the*, as [ko Mōsese kei Masara].

(61) *I see the man over there.*

au	raica	na	tamata	koyā
[I	(see Vt)]	[the	(man	yonder)]

Here the subject is uniquely marked—by /au/ embedded in the transitive Verb phrase (glossed *tr* or noted as Vt). When voice of a Verb phrase is simple intransitive, as in sentence (60), above, it is left unmarked in Fijian, and noted as [V] rather than [Vt] by us.

(62) *The children go to sleep.*

eratou	laki	moce	na	gone
[(they few)	(go	sleep)]	[the	child]

This shows Profile Dep-III, as does sentence (60), above. But here the subject embedded person markers in the Verb phrase do not merely redundantly echo the number of the subject as given in the Subject phrase (M for child non-committal as to number); it is the embedded subject that adds the information that the number of the subject is paucal (few), rather than singular or dual or plural (many).

(63) I want that tobacco (in your hands).

au	sa	via	na	tavako	oqori
[I	is]	[want Vt]	[the	(tobacco	there near you)]

The Object phrase, both here and in sentence (61), above, has its phrase nucleus (M for tobacco and for man, respectively) modified by a following modifier in reference to person addressed here, and in reference to non-first, non-second person in sentence (61).

(64) I drank the cup of kava.

au	a	gunuva	na	bilo	yaqona
[I	past	(drink Vt)]	[the	(cup	kava)]

The Object phrase of this sentence is structurally identical with the Subject phrase of sentence (13). In both sentences (64) and (13), the major morphemes in parentheses show modified-modifier order; in English this order would be (cupped-kava)—i.e. modifier-modified instead of the Fijian modified-modifier order.

(65) They are drinking the (this) kava.

eratou	gunuva	na	yaqona
[(they few)	(drink Vt)]	[the	kava]

If the kava that is apparently being drunk is referred to, as in Profile IV sentence (43), above, the Object phrase is unnecessary.

(66) They go for (after) the box.

erau	lakova	na	kato
[(they 2)	(go Vt)]	[the	box]

The transitive for go might be freely translated as seek—They seek the box.

(67) They fish in this place.

eratou	qoliva	na	vanua	oqō
[(they few)	(fish Vt)][the		(place	here)]

Transitive voice is marked by different consonant expansions of different major morphemes before the transitive suffix /-a/. For sentences (64), (65), (66) and (67), above, the consonant expansion is /-v-/; the M for sit, /dabe/, is expanded by /-c-/, /dabeca/ sit on Object; the M for good, /vinaka/, is expanded by /-t-/, vinakata like, want Object; the M for day, /siga/, is expanded by /-n-/, /sigana/ dry Object, and so on.

(68) They could see their boat.

erau	ā	raica	rawa	na	nodrau	waqa
[(they 2)	past	(see Vt)	can]	[the	(their 2)	boat]

The Verb phrase is [(m's) m (M-m) $\frac{m}{M}$], that is, a sequence of minor morphemes for embedded subject, following by tense marker minor morpheme, followed by phrase nucleus major morpheme (M-m for expanded M before transitive suffix /-a/), and finally followed by /rawa/ can which functions as a verb complement and hence as a minor morpheme in this phrase ($\frac{m}{M}$), but may function as phrase nucleus ($\frac{M}{m}$) in other phrases. When /rawa/ functions as verb complement, it appears after the phrase nucleus. When two or three verb complements appear after the phrase nucleus in other phrases, they occur in fixed relative order (namely, oti, rawa, kece, sara, tale, tiko (or /titū/), mada, mai (or /yani/), kina). This means that if /rawa/ can were to function as a verb complement with /oti/ perfective the latter would precede /rawa/; but if with /tale/ again, the latter would follow /rawa/ can.

(69) They saw the house.

eratou	ā	raica	na	vale
[(they few)	past	(see Vt)]	[the	house]

(70) They saw Fiji.

eratou ā raica Viti
[(they few) past (see Fiji)]

Sentence (69), like the preceding sentence (68), is a Profile Exp-IV sentence. In both, the Object phrase follows the embedded subject Vt phrase. However, (70) is a Profile III sentence, with embedded subject intransitive Verb phrase in which the major morpheme (M for Fiji) is modifier of the preceding modified major morpheme (M for see), comparable to English compounds like hay-making.

(71) Did you see him?

ko ā raici koya
[you past (see 3rd person)]

This is also a Profile III sentence, and is like (70) in structure; inverting to the English order, They Fiji-saw (70) is parallel to Did you him-saw? (71), and parallel also to They will us-ask (72).

(72) They will ask us.

eratou na tarogi kedatou
[(they few) will (ask us incl few)]

The minor morpheme glossed will belongs to a small set marking tense, which precedes phrase nucleus in Verb phrase; so also /ā/ past in sentences (68) on, above.

(73) I keep the village in mind.

au nanuma na koro
[I (think Vt)] [the village]

(74) The village is kept in mind.

sa nanumi na koro
[is (think Vp)] [the village]

(75) His hand (forearm) was broken.

e ra-musu na liga-na
[is (passive·break Vp)][the hand-his]

Only the first of the above three sentences begins with a Verb phrase which includes embedded subject in Vt phrase: (73) is a Profile Exp-IV sentence, with [Vt phrase] before [O phrase]; (74) and (75) are Profile I sentences, with passive verb phrase—[Vp phrase] before [S phrase]. The Subjects in (74) and (75) are subjects of [Vp phrase]—that is, passive verb phrase. In both these sentences the Verb phrase does not include embedded subject.

(76) The car struck him.

a coqai koya na motoka
[past (hit 3rd person)][the car]

Sentence (76) is a Profile I sentence, [V phrase] before [S phrase].

(77) This car was stolen.

e a butakoci na motoka
[is past (rob Vp)] [the car]

This is another so-called 'passive' example of a Profile I sentence, with intransitivized verb—but not embedded subject—appearing in Verb phrase before Subject phrase, as in sentence (74), above. If the subject were embedded in the Verb phrase, these sentences would exemplify Profile Exp-III (as (78), following) rather than Profile I.

(78) A few children are present.

e-ratou sa tiko ko i-ratou na gone
[(they few) is situated] [the (they few) the child]

The appositional Subject phrase (after the subject embedded Verb phrase) includes two minor morpheme phrase introducers, /ko/ before the phrase embedded person marker sequence after prefix i- for (they few) and /na/ before the major morpheme (M for child).

(79) Let your relatives be remembered.

mo	nanumi	i-ra	na	weka-mu
[(you imp)	(think Vp	them)]	[the	kin-your]

This is yet another example of the so-called 'passive' which like (74), above, has an intransitivizing suffix after the verb which appears in compound with the person-marker sequence not unlike those in sentences (71) and (72), above. But since an embedded subject (namely /mo/ 2nd person imperative) Verb phrase precedes the Subject phrase (for your kin), (79) is Profile Exp-III sentence (rather than a Profile I sentence without embedded subject in Verb phrase, as (74), (75) and (77), above). Inverting to English order, (79) might be read, Letyour kin be them-remembered. So also, sentence (80), following, must be read as a so-called 'passive', with Subject phrase after intransitive Verb phrase (The children were them-seen by me), or

(80) I saw the children.

au	a	raici	i-rātou	na	gone
[1st sg.	past	(see Vp	3rd few)]	[the	child]

This is another example of a Profile Exp-III sentence. For Profile Exp-IV examples including /raica/ see Vt and embedded subject in Verb phrase, compare sentences (61), (68), (69); for Profile III examples of Verb phrase including embedded subject and intransitivized /raici/ see compare sentences (70) and (71) which are more naturally read as simple intransitives rather than as 'passives'. Such reading does not conflict with determination of following Subject or Object phrase according to voice of Verb phrase, since Profile III and Profile

IV sentences include neither following Subject nor following Object phrases.

(81) The kava is drunk.

e gunuvi na yaqona
[is (drink Vp)] [the kava]

This is a passive intransitive example of a Profile I sentence. For a simple intransitive example of Profile III, see sentence (34): They (subject embedded in Verb phrase) are kava-drinking (gunu yaqona). Though sentence (81) must be read as 'passive', it cannot be naturally transformed to a Profile II with transitive Verb phrase. Sentences with transitive Verb phrases commonly include also embedded subject; a Profile II sentence is occasionally found without specification of Subject as in sentence (28); it would be grammatical but not natural to say:

e gunuva na yaqona
[is (drink Vt)] [the kava]

in which the second phrase would function as Object (He's drinking the kava). Sentence (65), above, would be more natural—a Profile Exp-IV sentence with embedded subject in transitive Verb phrase followed by Object phrase.

In Profile Exp-IV + [S phrase] sentences, the transitive Verb phrase is followed by both an Object phrase and a Subject phrase, generally in that order.

(82) The mother of the child hung up the clothes on the clothes line.

sa vaka rubeca na i-sulu e na isasau ni
[is (intensive hang Vt)] [the clothes] [on the line of
sulu ko tina ni gone
clothes] [the mother of child]

The order of phrases is [Vt 1] [O 2] [Profile V extension, L 3] [S 4]—with Object phrase (2) preceding Subject phrase (4). The Profile V extension

Location phrase may precede all others in a reordering in which the Object phrase would immediately precede the Subject phrase.

(83) Mark catches the pig.

sa	toboka	na	vuaka	ko	Mārikā
[is	(catch Vt)]	[the	pig]	[the	Mark]

(84) John throws the ball to Mary.

sa	viritaka	na	polo	vei	Mere	ko	Jone
[is	(throw Vt)]	[the	ball]	[to	Mary]	[the	John]

The order of phrases is [Vt 1] [O 2] [IO 3] [S 4]; both the Direct Object (2) and the Indirect Object (3) precede the Subject phrase (4). But in sentence (85) the Subject phrase precedes a string of Object phrases.

(85) John sees the fish, the taro, and the corn on his plate.

sa	raica	ko	Jone	na	ika	na	dalo	kei	na
[is	(see Vt)]	[the	John]	[the	fish],	[the	taro],	[and	the
sila	e	na	nona	veleti					
corn]	[on	the	(his)	plate]					

The order of phrases is [Vt 1], [S 2], [O 3] and [O 4], with each Object phrase introduced by one minor morpheme, [O 5] introduced by two minor morphemes, and Profile V extension, [L 6] introduced by two minor morphemes. After the first two Object phrases in the string of other Object phrases there is a conspicuous juncture, but there is close transition between the [Vt 1] [S 2] and the first Object phrase; and also close transition, without pause, between the last Object phrase, in the Object phrase string, and the Location phrase. However, the Location phrase can be reordered to appear before the others, or reordered to appear in sequence after [Vt 1] [S 2] before the Object phrase string. In such reordering, there is pause after each Object phrase in the Object phrase string.

Other reorderings are also possible, in correlation with other placements of juncture.

All of the preceding profiles appear in combination with Dependent profiles in more complex sentences, as Profile III before Dep III, already exemplified in sentences (41), (42), and (43) above, where the Verb phrase of the Dep III profile is introduced by minor morpheme /ka/ *and is*. In our sample, Verb phrases in Dep profiles are commonly introduced by minor morpheme /ni/, *that is*, *as*; and by /se/ *if is*, *or*; and by /ke/ *if is*; and by /ka/ *and is*, already mentioned. Less commonly encountered among minor morphemes which introduce Dep profiles is /de/ *lest*; and /me/ *let*, *that may* functions as Dep profile introducer, but also appears in self-sufficient sentences without Dep profile, as a non-second person imperative. Some sentences consist of strings of Dep profiles, in contrast to Verb phrases introduced by /sa/ or /e/ or embedded subject person marker. The latter occur but once in a sentence (not counting quantifier sequences beginning in /e/ which may be embedded in Subject or Object phrases). The favorite order that complex sentences follow is independent profile followed by one or more Dep profiles. A less favored sentence order is a string of two or more Dep profiles. Least common is the sentence order Dep profile as the first profile (or 'clause') in the sentence followed by independent profile.

(86) *They are about to go.*

sa	vō	leka	ni	rau	lako
[*is*	(*remain*	*short*)]	[*that is*	(*they 2*)	*go*]

The reduced Profile I phrase, introduced by minor morpheme /sa/, includes in parentheses a modified-modifier sequence of major morphemes (M M for *almost*); this is followed by Dep III profile introduced by minor morpheme /ni/; sentence

(86) might be read *It is a short time remaining, before they go.*

(87) *They can go if they so wish.*

e	rawa	ni	rau	lako
[is	able]	[that is	(they 2)	go]

(88) *They have permission to go.*

e	rawa	me	rau	lako
[is	able]	[that may	(they 2)	go]

Sentence (87) differs from (88) only in the selection of the Dep Verb phrase minor morpheme introducer: /ni/ *that is* for (87), /me/ *that may* for (88).

(89) *You can sleep.*

e	rawa	ni	ko	moce
[is	able]	[that is	you	sleep]

The subject of the independent Verb phrase is not specified; the subject of the following Dep Verb phrase is embedded in sentence (89). In sentence (90), following, the subject is embedded in the first Verb phrase rather than in the second Dep Verb phrase.

(90) *It is they who are about to go.*

erau	sa	vō	leka	ni	lako
[(they 2)	is	(remain	short)]	[that	go]

Here the first phrase reflects a Profile III and the second reflects a Dep I profile, while in sentence (86) it is the other way around: Profile I phrase before Dep Profile III phrase. Sentence (90) might be read *They are shortly staying, and then going.*

(91) *I'm not going.*

au	sa	sega	ni	lako
[I	is	not]	[that	go]

(92) Will you go or not?

ko na lako se sega

[you will go] [or is not]

Here Profile III precedes Dep Profile I, but the latter is introduced by minor morpheme /se/ or is.

(93) They chose him to be their chief.

era a digitaki koya me nodra turaga

[(is their) past (choose 3rd person)] [let be (their) chief]

The Ind profile might be read They have him-chosen before the Dep that (he) may be their chief.

The minor morpheme /me/ let be may also introduce a self-sufficient sentence (hence independent profile; so also, phrase introducer /mo/ with the embedded second person subject):

(94) Let us try (it)!

me datou tovolea

[let be (we few) try Vt]

(95) Try (it)!

mo tovolea

[let be you sg. try Vt]

(96) Let the lamp be extinguished.

me boko na cina

[let be extinguish][the lamp]

(97) Didn't you see the white dog?

odou a sega ni raica na kolī vula-vula

[(you few) past not] [[that is (see Vt)] [the (dog white-white)]]

Here Profile III precedes Dep Profile II, consisting of [Vt phrase] (introduced by minor morpheme /ni/) before [O phrase] (introduced by minor morpheme /na/).

(98) Had the chief known it, he would not have come.

ke	ā	kilā	na	turaga	ke	ā	sega	ni	lako	mai
[[if is	past	know]	[the	chief]]	[[if is	past	not]	[that is	go	here]]

All three profiles in this sentence have their Verb phrases introduced by dependent minor morpheme introducers: /kē/ if is introduces the first Verb phrase in Dep Profile I before [S phrase]; /kē/ also introduces the second Verb phrase paired with a following Verb phrase which is introduced by /ni/ that is.

(99) The car struck him, and (he) died instantly.

a	coqai	koya	na	motoka	ka	mate	sara
[[is	hit	3rd person]	[the	car]]	[a ˉ is	die	at once]

Profile I--[[V phrase] [S phrase]]—may occur as a self-sufficient sentence, as (76), above; here this Profile I is followed by Dep profile I, reduced to [V phrase], without specification of Subject. The Dep Verb phrase is introduced by minor morpheme /ka/ and is.

(100) Fiji is hotter than Tonga.

e	kata-kata	ko	Viti	ka	bata-batā	ko	Toga
[[is	(hot-hot)]	[the	Fiji]]	[[and is	(cold-cold)]	[the	Tonga]]

(101) Suva is larger than Lautoka.

e	levo	ko	Suva	ka	lai-lai	ko	Lautoka
[[is	big]	[the	Suva]]	[[and is	(little-little)]	[the	Lautoka]]

Both sentence (100) and (101) begin with Profile I—[V phrase] [Subject phrase]; these initial profiles may also occur as self-sufficient sentences, as (25) and (26), above. In both sentences (100) and (101), this Profile I is followed by Dep Profile I—[V phrase] [S phrase]. In each sentence, a comparative contrast is made such that the predication about the first subject is greater than but applies also to the second subject—the subject of the Dep profile. The literal predication for the Dep profile is an antonym of the predication for the preceding independent profile, but such antonym usage is a deliberate exaggeration for the sake of emphasizing the comparative contrast.

(102) They could see their boat.

e	rawa	ni	rau	raica	na	nodrau	waqa
[is	able]	[[that	(they 2)	(see Vt)]	[the	(their 2)	boat]]

Here Profile I is followed by Dep Profile II (rather than by I, as in sentences (87), (88), and (89), above). The free translation of sentence (102) does not differ from the free translation of sentence (68), above. But the structure of the two sentences differs: Exp-IV profile of sentence (68) versus Profile I phrase followed by Exp-IV Dep clause of the sentence (102).

(103) He did not see anything.

e	ā	sega	ni	raica	e	dua	na	kā
[is	past	not]	[[that	see]	[is	one	the	thing]]

The quantifier /e dua/ is embedded in the Object phrase. The Subject is simply not specified in sentence (103), nor in the following sentence (104).

(104) He cannot sleep.

e	sega	ni	moce	rawa
[is	not]	[that	sleep	able]

Compare (104) with sentence (89), above, in which the Subject is embedded in the second phrase (Dep III profile).

(105) It's possible to sleep.

e rawa ni moce

[is able] [that sleep]

Here again, the subject is not specified.

(106) I think your small basket is gone.

au nanuma ni sa yali na nomu kato

[I (think Vt)] [[that is is away] [the (your)(basket (

lai-lai

(small-small))]]

Here Profile IV—[ES Vt phrase]—precedes Dep Profile I—[[V phrase] [S phrase]].

(107) Did you know that there is no food?

o sa kilā ni sega na kākana

[you is understand] [[that is not] [the (food)]]

Here Profile III—[ES V phrase]—precedes Dep Profile I—[V phrase] [S phrase].

(108) Since he had no boat, he (therefore) went to borrow one.

ni sega na nona waqa e a laki kerea

[[as is not] [the (his) boat]] [is past (go borrow)

kina e dua

complement is one]

Here Dep Profile I—[V phrase] [S phrase]—precedes independent Profile I, reduced to [V phrase], with quantified phrase embedded in the [V phrase], after verb complement, /kina/.

(109) When the meal was over, they went to bed.

ni oti na kana era laki moce

[[when is finish] [the food]] [(they) (go sleep)]

This sentence also begins with Dep Profile I—[V phrase] [S phrase], as in (108), above; however, in sentence (10), the second independent profile is

Profile III rather than Profile I.

(110) As he had brought everything, he went.

ni sa volia oti na vei kā kece e a
[[as is (bring Vt) perfective] [the recip pl thing every]][is past
lako
go]

Here the Dep Profile II—[[ES Vt phrase] [O phrase]]—precedes independent Profile I reduced to [V phrase], without Subject specification in the entire sentence.

Compare (III): It's good they know it.

ke ra kilā sa vinaka
[if they know Vt] [is good]

ROTUMAN

3.4. Distinctions in the Rotuman sound system have been mentioned above (3.2). The sample of sentences given here follows the transcriptions used by Alan Howard of the Bishop Museum, rather than that of C. Maxwell Churchward's Rotuman Grammar and Dictionary (Australia, 1940).

Both Fijian and Rotuman loom large in recent discussions of the possible Polynesian affiliations of languages formerly classified as Melanesian, as is reported above (3.1) and in Indo-Pacific Fascicle One (1.3). In consonant inventory, Rotuman is closely similar to the aberrant Polynesian consonant types, with more than the average number of linear distinctions among stops, but with the usual Polynesian distinction of voiceless-voiced labial fricatives /f v/, and with the usual Polynesian restriction to a single series of stops. Fijian, on the other hand, is typically Melanesian in its consonant inventory which distinguishes prenasalized and voiced stops from the series of voiced stops. In vowel inventories, it is the other way around: the Fijian vowel type identical with the widespread Polynesian type—2(FB) over N (with short vowels contrasting with long vowels), while the Rotuman vowel system is apparently not of this type but rather of a type that may well distinguish more than the five vowels of the 2(FB) over N type (with unrounded vowels contrasting with rounded vowels).

Many sentence profiles in Fijian are like those encountered in the various Polynesian languages sampled. Even the highly characteristic Fijian verb phrase with embedded subject appears in Polynesia—at least in Western Polynesia. And most sentences in Fijian, as in the Polynesian sample, begin with some kind of verb phrase which is followed by subject phrase. In phrase interiors, minor morphemes of various kinds serve to introduce—and precede the major morpheme phrase nucleus—more often than not, both in Fijian and in the Polynesian languages sampled.

In Rotuman, however, sentence profiles are un-Polynesian in that many phrases are closed by minor morphemes glossed the (definite) and a (indefinite). These may be viewed as instances of phrase closers rather than phrase introducers, and on the other hand, the most frequent phrase order of both Fijian and Polynesian languages may be viewed as inverted in Rotuman and many other languages in Melanesia. That is to say, many sentence profiles in Rotuman show subject phrase before verb phrase. The sentence sample for Rotuman is certainly subadequate—in the sense in which Dyen uses the term 'subadequate'—but it serves to exemplify the general observations made so far.

(1) The child is asleep.

leʔ	meaʔmeaʔaʔ	he	ta	mosean
[(person	small	dim)	the]	[sleeps]

The parentheses in the first or Subject phrase points to a modified-modifier-modifier order; this [S phrase] is closed with the morpheme glossed the which is not a modifier of the preceding modifier as are modifiers enclosed in parentheses.

(2) A child is asleep.

leʔ	meaʔmeaʔ	he	t	moseana
[(person	small	dim)	a]	[sleep]

The [S phrase] is closed by the morpheme glossed a which is suffixed to the morphemes glossed in the preceding parentheses.

(3) They come.

iris	leumea
[they]	[come]

(4) I am drinking right now.

gou	ʔiomʔimoatou
[I]	[drink-drink-progressive]

The usual orthography for Rotuman uses the letter g for velar nasal /ŋ/, as in the [S phrase]. Instances of reduplication are indicated by repeating the gloss, as in the Verb phrase.

(5) They are drinking.

iris	täe	ʔiomʔimoʔaris
[they]	[there	drink-drink-ing]

Compare the suffix after the reduplication in [V phrase] here and in sentence (4).

(6) He is good.

ia	fa	lelei
[(he	male)]	[good]

The parentheses in the gloss for the [S phrase] points to a modified-modifier order. The [V phrase] is not closed with minor morpheme here; nor is it closed in the following sentences.

(7) The cup of kava is good.

ip	kav	he	ta	lelei
[(cup	kava	dim)	the]	[good]

(8) He is a good boy.

ia	leʔ	fa	meaʔmeaʔ	lelei	pau	he
[he]	[(child	male	little	good	very	dim.)]

The long parentheses for the gloss of the [V phrase] point to a modified-modifier order in which a series of five modifiers follow the modified— but without following closing morpheme.

(9) The restaurant is good.

ri	ʔateag	ta	lelei
[(house	eating)	the]	[good]

The closing minor morpheme after the modified-modifier parentheses serves also to indicate that the phrase so closed is an [S phrase] rather than a [V phrase] .

(10) They are off now.

iris	teʔis	laʔaris
[they]	[this time	go-ing]

(11) They have been going.

iris	laʔaris
[they]	[go-ing]

(12) I will go.

gou	la	laʔ
[I]	[fut.	go]

(13) They are going.

iris	täe	la	laʔaris
[they]	[there	future	go-ing]

(14) Here is a canoe.

vaka	teʔis
[canoe]	[here]

(15) Rotuma is hot.

rotuma	sʋn
[Rotuma]	[hot]

(16) *The nights are hot*.

pogi sun pau

[*nights*] [(*hot* *very*)]

(17) *We are hungry*.

amis sög ʔia

[*we*] [*starve* *m*]

The value of the morpheme glossed minor morpheme (*m*) in the [V phrase] is uncertain; in such cases, here and below, we can at least indicate that the uncertain morpheme is not a phrase nucleus—not a major morpheme(*M*).

(18) *Suva is large*.

suva tiʔ pau

[*Suva*] [(*big* *very*)]

(19) *My box is lost*.

ʔotou kes ta maoana

[(*my* *box*) *the*] [*lost*]

The parentheses in the [S phrases] point to an unusual modifier-modified order.

(20) *He wants to mate*.

ia pa tou

[*he*] [*want* *copulate*]

(21) *The sea is very rough*.

säs ta val pau

[*sea* *the*] [(*rough* *very*)]

(22) *The moon is setting.*

hual ta soloan

[*moon* *the*] [*set-ing*]

(23) The net is short.

vao	ta	luak
[net	the]	[short]

(24) He sleeps a long time.

ia	mös	roa	pan
[he]	[(sleeps	long	very)]

(25) The clock is about to stop.

uaj	he	teʔis	ʔel	pan	la	fuʔ
[(clock	dim.)	this]	[(near	very	fut.	stop)]

In the [S phrase] the unusal closing morpheme is glossed this. In the [V phrase] a string of modifiers precede rather than follow the modified, glossed stop.

(26) There are three canoes.

vak	fol
[canoe]	[three]

(27) There is a canoe available.

vak	teʔis	po	seʔma	la	ʔesʔaoʔak
[canoe	this]	[(possible	as soon as	future	use)]

All the preceding sentences—(1) to (27)—show the profile [S phrase] [V phrase]. The label for the second phrase is unfortunate if it suggests that this [V phrase] always includes in its interior a 'verb' which can be justified as a 'part of speech'. This is not intended. The [V phrase] is so labelled to give a rough indication of the contrast of this phrase to phrases with other functions, as [S phrase] . Nor does our [V phrase] imply (as does VP in transformational grammar) that a later expansion will turn out to include a nominal of some kind. Such an implication would require us (1) to introduce 'part of speech' terminology which we want to avoid, and (2) to include in one phrase more than one function. Contrasting functions are treated below in terms of separate phrases, as Location or [L phrase] , and as Object or [O phrase], and so on.

(28) They fish in this place.

iria	hagoat	ʔe	te	käe	he	teʔis
[they]	[fish]	[in	(place	there	dim.)	this]

The last or [L phrase] begins with a phrase introducer glossed in, which is followed by a parenthesis pointing to the modified-modifier-modifier order, and followed by a closing morpheme glossed this.

(29) They have been to Rotuma.

iris	kel	se	rotuma
[they]	[are]	[to	Rotuma]

(30) John is going to the house.

jone	täe	la	laʔan	se	ri	ta
[John]	[there	fut.	go-prog.]	[to	house	the]

In the last or [L phrase] , the major morpheme phrase nucleus for house is flanked by a morpheme introducer glossed to, and a closing morpheme glossed the.

(31) I am going to the village.

gou	täe	la	laʔatou	se	hoʔag	ta
[I]	[there	future	go-prog.]	[to	village	the]

The [L phrase] here also ends in a closing morpheme for the. But when the major morpheme phrase nucleus is a place name, as in sentence (29) above, the closing morpheme does not appear.

(32) I live in this house.

gou	noh	ʔe	ri	teʔis
[I]	[live]	[in	house	this]

(33) Samuel is in New Zealand.

samuela	täe	ʔe	niuseragi
[Samuel]	[is there]	[in	New Zealand]

(34) There is a coconut tree in Kalvaka.

nin	hūnt	täe	ʔe	kalvak	ta
[coconut	tree]	[is there]	[in	Kalvak	the]

Sentences (28) to (34), above, show the profile [S phrase][V phrase] [L phrase] . In this sample, the phrase introducer in the [L phrase] is a minor morpheme, either /ʔe/ in, or /se/ to. The last two sentences in this group, (33) and (34), show that an occasional morpheme, called dual function morpheme, may function as a major morpheme phrase nucleus in some phrases—as /täe/ is there—and as a minor morpheme phrase introducer in other phrases—as /täe/ in the [V phrase] of sentence (35).

(35) He told us.

ia	täe	ʔea	se	ʔamisa
[he]	[there	tell]	[to	us]

(36) They will ask us.

iris	la	saʔio	se	ʔisa
[they]	[fut..	ask]	[to	us]

(37) They saw Fiji.

iris	räe	se	fiti
[they]	[see]	[to	Fiji]

(38) They could see their boat.

iria	la	räe	seˀma	se	ˀoria	vak	ta
[they]	[future	see	possible]	[to	their	boat	the]

(39) They saw the house.

iris	räe	se	ri	ta
[they]	[see]	[to	house	the]

(40) I saw the children.

gou	räe	se	laˀriri	ta
[I]	[see]	[to	children	the]

(41) I want that tobacco.

gou	pa	ˀes	ˀe	rau	taˀa
[I]	[want	possess]	[on	tobacco	that]

Sentences (35) to (41), above, also show the profile[S phrase] [V phrase] [L phrase] , and the phrase introducer in the Location phrase is again either /se/ to , or /ˀe/ on. The major morpheme phrase nucleus in the preceding [V phrase] is /ˀea/ glossed tell, or /saˀio/ glossed ask, or /räe/ glossed see, or /ˀes/ possess. In English one tells, asks, sees, or possesses an object; in Rotuman the Subject tells in a location, asks in location, and sees and possesses in different locations. But after [V phrase] with other major morpheme phrase nuclei, the Subject catches an object, chooses an object, takes a object, thinks an object, or drinks an object--as in sentences (42) to (48). These sentences show [S phrase][V phrase] [O phrase]profile.

(42) Mark catches the pig.

mareko	poˀia	puak	ta
[Mark]	[catch]	[pig]	[the]

(43) They chose him to be their chief.

iris	hil	ia	la		ʔoris	fa	ʔes	ituʔu
[they]	[(choose	him)	future]		[their	(man	m	important)]

The parentheses in the [V phrase] point to the usual modified-modifier order.

(44) He has taken the book.

da	hoaʔ	vahia	puk	he	ta
[he]	[take	completive]	[(book	dim.)	the]

(45) I keep the village in mind.

gou	aʔhäeʔ	hoʔag	ta
[I]	[think]	[village	the]

(46) I drank the cup of kava.

gou	ʔiom	ip	kav	he	ta
[I]	[drink]	[(cup	kava	dim.)	the]

(47) They drink it.

iris	ʔiom	ʔe
[they]	[drink]	[it]

(48) They were drinking the kava.

iris	täe	ʔiomʔioma	kav	ta
[they]	[there	(drink-drink)]	[kava	the]

Compare the reduplicated major morpheme in the V phrase of sentence (48), above, which is followed by transitive suffix /a/—M-M-m—with the reduplicated major morpheme in sentence (49), below, which is not suffixed—hence M-M.

(49) They drank kava.

iris	täe	ʔiomʔiom	kava
[they]	[there	(drink-drink	kava)]

The parentheses in the [V phrase] point to the modified-modifier order, which would be the other way around in a closer free translation: They were kava-drinking. The profile for sentence (49) is [S phrase] [V phrase].

In the next three sentences, the [S phrase] is followed by a Possessive or [P phrase] which is optional and is dependent on the preceding [S phrase] or, in other words, is an explication of the preceding [S phrase]. The minor morpheme phrase introducer for the [P phrase] is glossed of.

(50) The young man's canoe is lost.

vak	ʔon	räi	fa	haharag	ta	maoana
[canoe]	[of	(young	male	youth)	the]	[lost]

This sentence shows profile [S phrase] [P phrase] [V phrase].

(51) The child's mother hung up the clothes on the clothes line.

öʔhou	ta	ʔon	leʔ	meaʔmeaʔ	he	ta
[(mother	the]	[of	(child	little	dim.)	the]

ʔöp ʔakia	haʔu	se	voea	ta
[hang]	[cloth]	[on	line	the]

This sentence shows profile [S phrase] [P phrase] [V phrase] [O phrase][L phrase].

(52) The villagers have three boats.

famöi	ne	hoʔag	ta	ma	ʔoris	vak	fol
[people]	[of	village	the]	[own]	[their	(canoe	three)]

This sentence shows profile [S phrase] [P phrase] [V phrase] [O phrase].

The next two sentences exemplify profile [S phrase] [V phrase] [L phrase], and the fact that the major morpheme phrase nucleus in the [V phrase] is flanked by the same minor morphemes to mark negation, and yes-or-no question.

(53) He did not see anything.

ia	kat	räe	ra	se	te	ta
[he]	[not	see	not]	[to	thing	the]

(54) Didn't you see the white dog?

ka	?äe	kat	räe	ra	se	kam	fis	ta
[m	you]	[not	see	not]	[to	(dog	white)	the]

In the profile of sentence (55), following--[S phrase] [V phrase] [O phrase] [L phrase]—the last or Location phrase specifies what, from an English point of view, would be the indirect object.

(55) John throws the ball to Mary.

jone	kir?akia	poi	he	ta	se mere
[John]	[throw]	[(ball	dim.)	the]	[to Mary]

In the profile of sentence (56), following-- [S phrase] [V phrase] [L phrase] [L phrase] —the final Location phrase specifies location of time.

(56) We came here yesterday.

amis	leum	se	te?is	?e	asa
[we]	[come]	[to	here]	[on	yesterday]

The next three sentence show Echo phrases. In (57) and (58), the first [V phrase] is followed by a second [Echo V phrase]. In (59) , the first [L phrase] is followed by a pair of [Echo L phrase]s, before a non-echo [L-P phrase]. The phrase introducer for each Echo phrase is the minor morpheme /ma/glossed and.

(57) They have eaten well and drunk well.

iris	?ate	lelei	ma	?iom	lelei
[they]	[(eat	well)]	[and	(drink	well)]

This sentence, and (58), following, show profile [S phrase] [V phrase] [Echo V phrase].

(58) They have eaten and drunk well.

iris	?ate	ma	?iom	lelei	pau
[they]	[eat]	[and	(drink	well	very)]

(59) John sees the fish, the taro, and the corn on his plate.

jone	räe	se	ia?	ta	ma	?a?an	ta
[John]	[see]	[to	fish	the]	[and to	taro	the]

ma	kon	ta	?e	?on	?umef	ta
[and to	corn	the]	[on	of	plate	the]

This sentence shows profile [S phrase] [V phrase] [L phrase][Echo L phrase] [Echo L phrase] [L-P phrase.]

The remaining sentences in our sample of Rotuman are given without further comment.

(60) Where is father?

ka	tei	?otou	ö?fa	ta
[m	where]	[my	father	the]

(61) What is this?

tese	te?is
[what]	[this]

(62) I'm not going.

gou	kal	la?	ra
[I]	[not	go	not]

(63) Had the chief known it, he would not have came.

repoi	ka	fa	?es	itu?	ta	?inea	ma	ia
[if	m	man]	[of	important	the]	[(know	own)]	[he]

kal	leum	ra
[not	come	not]

(64) Will you or won't you go?

ʔae la laʔ ne igki

[you] [fut. go] [or not]

(65) The car struck him and he died instantly.

motoka ta hen ʔe ia ma ia ʔal ma ʔe

[car the] [strike][to him] and he die] [and to

ʔav he ta

time dim. the]

(66) You can sleep.

äe po sema la mös

[you] [(able quite fut. sleep)]

(67) There's a lot of sweat on his back, his hands and also on his legs.

pumahan raurant täe ʔe ʔon fomafua

[sweat much-much] [there on his back]

ʔe ʔon ʔuhapa ma ʔe ʔon la hapa

[on his arm] [and on his leg]

(68) Mary has a plate.

mere ma ʔon umefe

[Mary] [own her plate]

(69) They go after the box.

iris laʔaris se kes ta

[they] [go-prog.] [to box the]

(70) I see the man.

gou räe se fa ta

[I] [see] [to man the]

(71) The children go to sleep.

läʔririʔi laʔ la mös

[children] [go fut. sleep]

(72) His hand was broken.

ʔon ʔuhapa toʔvahia

[his hand] [break-complete]

(73) This car was stolen.

motoka teʔis hanaʔ se

[car this] [steal m]

(74) A few children are here.

läʔriri hena ʔesea teʔis

[children] [(few only here)]

(75) Think of your relatives.

aʔhäeʔak ʔou kainaga

[think] [your relative]

(76) The kava is drunk.

kav ta ʔiom vahia

[kava the] [drink comp.]

(77) They are John and Mary.

iria le jone ma mere

[they-dual] [John] [and Mary]

(78) There are really only two white mats.

apei rua pan ʔesea

[(white mat two)] [very only]

(79) There are two men standing over there.

fa	rua	ʔe	fufum	ʔe	täe
[(male	two)]	[on	stand-stand]	[on	there]

(80) Mosese and Masara are asleep.

mosese	ma	masara	moseara
[Mosese]	[and	Masara]	[sleep]

(81) The land of the Rotumans is good.

hanua	ʔon	famör	rotuma	lelei
[land]	[of	(people	Rotuma)]	[good]

(82) He could not sleep.

ia	kat	po	ra	la	mös
[he]	[(not	able	not)	fut.	sleep]

(83) The car struck him.

motoka	ta	hen	ʔe	ia
[car	the]	[strike]	[to	him]

(84) Let us go to Suva.

leum	la	laʔas	se	suva
[come	fut.	go-prog.]	[to	Suva]

(85) Do sit down!

päe	sio	äe
[(sit	down)]	[you]

The Following Abbreviations Will Be Used

AA	American Anthropologist
ACLS	American Council of Learned Societies
AES-P	American Ethnological Society, Publication
AL	Anthropological Linguistics
APS-P	American Philosophical Society, Proceedings
APS-T	American Philosophical Society, Transactions
BAE-B	Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin
BAE-R	Bureau of American Ethnology, Report
CU	Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology
IJAL	International Journal of American Linguistics
IUPAL	Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics
JAF	Journal of American Folklore
JSAP	Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris
Lg	Language
RCPAFL	Research Center Publications in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics
SJA	Southwestern Journal of Anthropology
SIL	Studies in Linguistics
TCLP	Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague
UMPL	University of Michigan Publications, Linguistics
UCPAAE	University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology
UCPL	University of California Publications in Linguistics
VFPA	Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology
WDWLS	William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series

CONTENTS

INDO-PACIFIC FASCICLE THREE

3.1. Unified list of Austronesian Languages in Melanesia 2

3.2. Sample of sound systems in Melanesia 34

3.3. Bauan dialect of Fijian 69

3.4. Rotuman sentence profiles 110